SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 1223 11168 3539

1990-91

UMTA SECTION 9 PROGRAM OF PROJECTS

THE NINE-COUNTY SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA

DRAFT

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
AUG 16 1990
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

D
REF
388.4097
C12879u
1990/91

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
JOSEPH P. BORT METROCENTER · 101 EIGHTH STREET · OAKLAND, CA 94607-4700 · 415/464-7700 · FAX: 415/464-7848

3 1223 11168 3539

MTC Commissioners

ROD DIRIDON - CHAIRPERSON
Representing Santa Clara County

STEVE WEIR - VICE-CHAIR
Representing Cities of
Contra Costa County

DAVE KARP
Representing Cities of
Alameda County

EDWARD R. CAMPBELL
Representing Alameda County

ROBERT I. SCHRODER
Representing Contra Costa County

ROBERT B. STOCKWELL
Representing Marin County

FRED NEGRI
Representing Napa County

HARRY G. BRITT
Representing San Francisco County

DORIS W. KAHN
Representing San Francisco Mayor

JANE BAKER
Representing Cities of
San Mateo County

TOM NOLAN
Representing San Mateo County

JAMES T. BEALL, JR.
Representing Cities of
Santa Clara County

JAMES SPERING
Representing Solano County

WILLIAM R. "BILL" LUCIUS
Representing Sonoma County

DIANNE McKENNA
Representing Association of
Bay Area Governments

ANGELO J. SIRACUSA
Representing San Francisco Bay
Conservation and Development
Commission

PRESTON KELLEY
Representing State Business,
Transportation and
Housing Agency

Executive Staff

LAWRENCE D. DAHMS
Executive Director

WILLIAM F. HEIN
Deputy Executive Director

Urban Mass Transportation Act
FY 1990-91 Program of Projects
for Section 9 Funds
for all urbanized areas within the
San Francisco Bay Area Region

DRAFT

Prepared and Published by
Metropolitan Transportation Commission
Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter
101 Eighth Street
Oakland, CA 94607
415/464-7700

August 1990

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

MTC wishes to thank the transit operators listed below for their assistance and cooperation in developing this Program of Projects. They will be responsible for its successful implementation.

San Francisco–Oakland Urbanized Area
Alameda Contra Costa Transit District
San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District
California Department of Transportation (CalTrain)
Central Contra Costa Transit Authority
Golden Gate Bridge, Highway & Transportation District
Livermore Amador Valley Transit Authority
San Francisco Municipal Railway
San Mateo County Transit District
City of Vallejo

San Jose Urbanized Area
California Department of Transportation (CalTrain)
Santa Clara County Transit District

Antioch-Pittsburg Urbanized Area
San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District

Fairfield Urbanized Area
City of Fairfield

Napa Urbanized Area
City of Napa

Santa Rosa Urbanized Area
City of Santa Rosa
County of Sonoma

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2015

https://archive.org/details/urbanmasstranspo1990cali

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT
FY 1990-91 PROGRAM OF PROJECTS
FOR SECTION 9 FUNDS

FOR ALL URBANIZED AREAS
WITHIN THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA REGION

Table of Contents

		Page
I.	Introduction	i
II.	Program of Projects: San Francisco - Oakland UZA	1
	o Grantee: AC Transit	3
	o Grantee: BART	24
	o Grantee: CalTrans	31
	o Grantee: CCCTA	42
	o Grantee: GGBHTD	53
	o Grantee: LAVTA	64
	o Grantee: San Francisco MUNI	65
	o Grantee: SamTrans	88
	o Grantee: Vallejo	95
III.	Program of Projects: San Jose UZA	96
	o Grantee: CalTrans	97
	o Grantee: SCCTD	103
IV.	Program of Projects: Antioch-Pittsburg UZA	109
	o Grantee: BART	110
V.	Program of Projects: Fairfield UZA	117
	o Grantee: Fairfield	118
VI.	Program of Projects: Napa UZA	119
	o Grantee: Napa	120
VII.	Program of Projects: Santa Rosa UZA	134
	o Grantee: Santa Rosa	135
	o Grantee: Sonoma County	136

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT
FY 1990-91 PROGRAM OF PROJECTS
FOR SECTION 9 FUNDS
FOR ALL URBANIZED AREAS WITHIN THE
SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA REGION

INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

This Program of Projects represents a coordinated proposal for the use of Federal formula block grant funds by all eligible transit agencies in the San Francisco Bay Area for fiscal year 1990-91.

In 1982 the Urban Mass Transportation Act was amended to include a formula-based block grant program under Section 9 to provide funds for public mass transportation. The Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA) apportions these Section 9 funds to all of the urbanized areas in the nation. The funds may be used for planning, capital projects, or operating assistance, with a limit on the latter. Under this program a transit agency can prepare and submit a single application and budget for a block grant to fund all of its projects, instead of preparing several applications and budgets for each individual project.

State law designates the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) as the regional transportation planning agency for the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area. MTC is also the designated recipient under federal law for Urban Mass Transportation block grant funds for the two largest urbanized areas in the region - San Francisco/Oakland and San Jose. The designated recipient is required to develop a program of projects to be funded pursuant to Section 9, in consultation with interested parties, including private transportation providers. Transit operators in the MTC region have consulted with private sector providers, and MTC mails copies of the Program of Projects and the Transportation Improvement Program to interested private sector transit providers. Therefore, MTC has developed a program of projects for all transit agencies in the two larger urbanized areas within the region.

The Governor of the State of California serves as the designated recipient for the four smaller urbanized areas within the region -Antioch/Pittsburg, Napa, Fairfield and Santa Rosa. However, the State Department of Transportation (Caltrans) has agreed that MTC should also develop a program of projects for the four smaller urbanized areas in the region.

Activities included in the program of projects are intended to maintain or improve existing transit services within the region. Improvement projects include the construction, reconstruction and rehabilitation of maintenance facilities, the purchase of transit stations, vehicles, and various parts and equipment, and other capital projects to improve the capacity, safety and service reliability of the region's public transportation systems.

PROCESS

Each year, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission adopts the Transit Capital Priorities Process and Criteria. The Process and Criteria are the rules, criteria and schedule for developing the region's transit capital priorities. As defined in the process and criteria, the priority setting process is a cooperative evaluation of projects by MTC and the individual transit operators. The result of this evaluation is a ranking that establishes a regional five-year program constrained by anticipated resources.

As a first step in the process, operators submit five-year capital requests to MTC. These operator requests are developed through the ongoing short range transit planning work done by the operators. UMTA regulations require that public transit agencies review proposed capital improvement programs with private providers of public transportation services.

MTC staff, in cooperation with operator staff, evaluate and score all new projects using the appropriate rules from the adopted criteria. Estimated funding levels constrain the size of the overall program, and those projects that score above the estimated apportionments are included in the Transit Capital priorities list adopted by the Commission.

Next, the projects in the Transit Capital Priorities are included in the Transit Element of the federal Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) by year, over the five year period, to indicate what funding will be requested from the federal funding agencies for transit improvement.

After the TIP is assembled, the UMTA Section 9 Program of Projects is developed for all Annual Element (first year) capital projects and operating assistance for which Section 9 funds will be requested. These Annual Element projects are separated by operator.

Once MTC, as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the region, has approved both the TIP Transit Element and the Program of Projects, it can review transit operator applications for the Section 9 funds. Those applications for programs of projects which are found consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) can then be forwarded to the funding agencies for grant approval.

The Program of Projects is based on an estimated federal appropriation for the Section 9 Program for FY 1991, plus any carryover of prior year funds. In the absence of final federal appropriations or actual apportionments, MTC has programmed about $80 million for use within the San Francisco-Oakland and San Jose urbanized areas, with an additional $6 million available for use in the four smaller urbanized areas - Santa Rosa, Napa, Fairfield and Antioch-Pittsburg. In the event that actual appropriations are lower than what MTC has estimated, the Section 9 program will be subject to reevaluation. Cutbacks may reduce the funding for some projects and eliminate others from the program.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This Program of Projects includes projects to be implemented by: the Alameda Contra Costa Transit District (AC Transit); the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART); the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans); the Central Contra Costa Transit Authority (CCCTA); the Golden Gate Bridge, Highway & Transportation District (GGBHTD); the Livermore Amador Valley Transit Authority (LAVTA); the San Francisco Municipal Railway (SF Muni); the San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans); the Santa Clara County Transit District (SCCTD); the Cities of Santa Rosa, Napa, Vallejo and Fairfield, and the County of Sonoma.

The projects are listed by transit operator for each urbanized area. Information about these projects has been furnished to private transportation providers to enable them to participate in the development of this Program of Projects. The Program and Budget Sheet for each transit operator shows the cost and amount of Section 9 funds needed for each project, and serves as an index to individual Project Justification Worksheets.

The Project Justification Worksheets provide the following detailed information:

* the name of the implementing transit agency
* the project name
* the project description, including the nature of the project and the amount and kind of equipment to be purchased, or the location and extent of construction or rehabilitation
* a project class code identifying the capital items involved in standard nomenclature
* references to the location of the project in the operator's latest Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP) and MTC's Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
* the proposed funding for the project, showing sources and amounts of federal funds and required local match
* any prior UMTA funding, with both sources and amounts
* the type and status of any environmental assessment
* a private sector participation compliance checklist
* the planning justification for the project

-blank-

FY 1990-91 SECTION 9 PROGRAM OF PROJECTS

SAN FRANCISCO-OAKLAND URBANIZED AREA

SAN FRANCISCO / OAKLAND URBANIZED AREA
Designated Recipient: METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

UMTA SECTION 9 FUNDS PROGRAMMED

FY 1990–91 Apportionment (Est.):	$64,277,064
FY 1989–90 Carryover Funds (Exp.):	370,008
TOTAL:	$64,647,072

PROGRAM OF PROJECTS
OPERATING ASSISTANCE

	UMTA Section 9 Funds	UMTA Section 9 Cumulative Total
AC Transit	$14,667,576	
BART	0	
CalTrain	586,221	
CCCTA	1,272,538	
GGBHTD	1,582,099	
LAVTA	0	
S.F. MUNI	0	
SamTrans	1,475,015	
Vallejo	192,306	
	$19,775,755	
		$19,775,755

PROGRAM OF PROJECTS
CAPITAL PROJECTS

	UMTA Section 9 Funds	UMTA Section 9 Cumulative Total	Local Match	Total FY 1990–91 Cost
AC Transit				
Replacement Buses (33 small)	$5,010,768		$1,252,692	$6,263,460
Service Vehicle Replacement (12)	165,440		41,360	206,800
Replace Lifts	1,751,160		437,790	2,188,950
Oil Water Separators	147,000		36,750	183,750
Bus Fueling Nozzle	672,000		168,000	840,000
	$7,746,368		$1,936,592	$9,682,960
		$27,522,123		

PROGRAM OF PROJECTS
CAPITAL PROJECTS

	UMTA Section 9 Funds	UMTA Section 9 Cumulative Total	Local Match	Total FY 1990-91 Cost
BART				
Fruitvale A.I.P.	$800,000		$200,000	$1,000,000
Walnut Creek A.I.P.	800,000		200,000	1,000,000
	$1,600,000		$400,000	$2,000,000
		$29,122,123		
CalTrain				
Accessibility (SFO)	$3,372,932		$1,331,233	$4,704,165
Ticket Vending Equipment (SFO)	1,166,497		291,624	1,458,121
SF Terminal Extension (SFO)	1,312,500		7,203,125	8,515,625
	$5,851,929		$8,825,982	$14,677,911
		$34,974,052		
CCCTA				
Maintenance Shop Equipment	$254,770		$63,693	$318,463
Bus Rehabilitation I (engines)	358,400		89,600	448,000
Bus Rehabilitation II (a.c.,interiors)	350,933		87,733	438,666
	$964,103		$241,026	$1,205,129
		$35,938,155		
GGBHTD				
Replacement Buses (39)	$7,584,755		$1,896,189	$9,480,944
Fuel Storgage Tank – San Rafael	1,439,086		359,772	1,798,858
Replacement Ferry (1)	3,401,433		850,358	4,251,791
	$12,425,274		$3,106,319	$15,531,593
		$48,363,429		
S.F. MUNI				
Fixed Facility Rehab/Improvement	$6,674,080		$1,668,520	$8,342,600
Misc. Maint. & Repair Equipment	1,144,500		286,125	1,430,625
Non-Revenue Vehicles	729,304		182,326	911,630
DataProcessing & Office Equipment	875,164		218,791	1,093,955
Rehab 10 PCC Streetcars	2,632,632		658,158	3,290,790
Trolley OVHD Reconstruct-Rt #14	3,035,096		758,774	3,793,870
Replace 24th & Utah Shops	449,496		112,374	561,870
	$15,540,272		$3,885,068	$19,425,340
		$63,903,701		
SamTrans				
Replacement Vans (4)	$281,280		$70,320	$351,600
Expans. Buses-(6 w/over match)	674,458		520,215	1,194,673
	$955,738		$590,535	$1,546,273
		$64,859,439		

SAN FRANCISCO / OAKLAND URBANIZED AREA
Designated Recipient: METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Grantee: ALAMEDA-CONTRA COSTA TRANSIT DISTRICT

UMTA SECTION 9 FUNDS PROGRAMMED

FY 1990-91 Apportionment (Est.):	$64,277,064
FY 1989-90 Carryover Funds (Exp.):	370,008
TOTAL:	$64,647,072

PROGRAM OF PROJECTS
OPERATING ASSISTANCE

	UMTA Section 9 Funds	Local Match	FY 1990-91 Net Project Cost
AC Transit *	$14,667,576	$74,722,424	$89,390,000

PROGRAM OF PROJECTS
CAPITAL PROJECTS

	UMTA Section 9 Funds	Local Match	Total FY 1990-91 Cost
AC Transit			
Replacement Buses (33 small)	$5,010,768	$1,252,692	$6,263,460
Service Vehicle Replacement (12)	165,440	41,360	206,800
Replace Lifts	1,751,160	437,790	2,188,950
Oil Water Separators	147,000	36,750	183,750
Bus Fueling Nozzle	672,000	168,000	840,000
	$7,746,368	$1,936,592	$9,682,960
TOTAL GRANTEE PROGRAM:	$22,413,944	$76,659,016	$99,072,960

* For the period July 1, 1990 to June 30, 1991.

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION WORKSHEET
For Projects Submitted For FY 90 - 91
of MTC's Transit Capital Priorities

1. OPERATOR: Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District

2. PROJECT NAME: AC 1 - Replacement Buses

3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Purchase 33 Small Transit Buses

4. PROJECT CLASS: (1) New or Used Vehicles

5. SRTP PAGE REFERENCE: 155 thru 159 TIP PAGE REFERENCE: I-6-5

6. PROPOSED FEDERAL FUNDING: $5,010,678 UMTA Section 9

7. PROPOSED LOCAL MATCH: (20%) $ 1,252,692 Toll Bridge Revenue

8. TOTAL PROJECT COST: $6,263,460

9. PRIOR UMTA FUNDING: None

10. ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT TYPE AND STATUS:

NEPA STATUS: 23 CFR 771.117 (c)(17)
CEQA STATUS: 14 Cal Admin. Code, Section 15302

11. COMPLIANCE WITH PRIVATE SECTOR PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENTS (CIRCULAR NO. 7005.1):
(PLEASE COMPLETE FOR ANNUAL ELEMENT PROJECTS ONLY):

a. Was the private sector involved in the development of this project as set forth by your adopted policy?

_____ No. __X__ Yes: SRTP Page Reference Appendix K*

b. Were proposals received from the private sector to operate, construct, or otherwise provide all or part of the above named projects?

__X__ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, how were those proposals evaluated? Reference _____)

c. Are there impediments affecting your ability to contract for the above named project?

__X__ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, have you taken measures to address the impact of these impediments? Reference _____)

d. Have you received any formal complaints from the private sector regarding this project?

__X__ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, how have the complaints been addressed? Reference _____)

If proper references to the above questions are not contained in the SRTP, please elaborate under a separate heading as part of "12. PLANNING JUSTIFICATION" below.

12. PLANNING JUSTIFICATION:

Private Sector

*The Private Sector will be invited to comment on the above project at a public hearing held each year in conjunction with other regional transit operators and coordinated by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission. This public hearing is not referenced in our SRTP. Notification of this hearing is via newspaper ads and through a mailing to private sector providers.

The District's Bus Replacement Program prescribes the replacement of buses that have exceeded their useful life. The Program establishes an acceptable bus life of 12 years and identifies those buses that need replacement. The SRTP presents current status and future replacement needs and establishes an even replacement program using a 12 year life. The bus fleet will be comprised of an active fleet of 810 buses and a contingency fleet of 37 buses, or a total bus fleet of 847 buses. An even bus replacement program calls for approximately 68 bus replacements each year; however, in preparation for implementation of the Comprehensive Service Plan (CSP) the District is proposing purchase of 33 small (equal to or less than 30 feet) sized buses for this project year. This is the equivalent to and will be replacing 31 standard sized buses.

The buses to be replaced annually over the next 7 years more than exceed the 12-year standard (average age at time of funding = 14 years) and will have a documented history of maintenance malfunctions. Annually the maintenance history of the buses will be reviewed to determine which buses will be replaced. Age will be a factor. However, those buses over 12 years old requiring extensive maintenance will be replaced in each program year. The list of buses to be replaced will be updated and submitted annually with our Section 9 application.

AC Transit's request for replacement buses takes into consideration the impact our CSP will have on the District's bus fleet, the purchase of 30 articulated buses from Santa Clara, 30 new articulated buses, along with the termination of the BART Express Contract in January, 1989 and projected increases in patronage. The attached replacement schedule conforms to UMTA requirements and spare ratios.

7907a.50

A. Continuation of Prior Commitment

1. This project is not a continuation of a funded multi-year project. However, purchasing replacement buses is an ongoing annual project that the operator continues to assign high priority.

B. Project Merit

1. This project will directly benefit the passengers as it will enable the District to maintain a fleet of buses that is safe, reliable and comfortable.

2. This project will directly produce benefits to system productivity and efficiency as the units replaced each year will be those that have shown themselves to be the most costly of the fleet to maintain at an appropriate service level.

3. This project addresses significant regional goals or policies as the new buses will have up-to-date, state-of-the-art accessibility equipment allowing the District to better serve the E & H Community with safe, reliable service.

4. This project will involve the replacement of buses for maintaining existing service according to a planned replacement program as previously noted.

7907a.51

IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE AND EXPENDITURE PLAN

Date: REVISED 02-06-90
Project: AC1 - REPLACEMENT BUSES
Operator: ALAMEDA-CONTRA COSTA TRANSIT DISTRICT
Beginning: FY 90-91
Initial Clearances Required:

IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE:	FY 90-91 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 91-92 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 92-93 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 93-94 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 94-95 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4
TASK 1:APPROV. PURCH. COM.	XXO		XXO	XXO	XXO
TASK 2: DEVELOP SPECS.	X		X	X	X
TASK 3: BOARD APPROVAL	XXXO		XXXO	XXXO	XXXO
TASK 4: BID PROCESS	XX		XX	XX	XX
TASK 5: DELIV. PROCESS	XXXXXXXXXXXXXX	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	XXXXXXXXXXXXXX	XXXXXXXXXXXXXX	XXXXXXXX
TASK 6:SERV. PREPARATION	X	X	X	X	X
TASK 7:					

O: Clearances and Approvals

EXPENDITURE PLAN (000$):	FY 90-91	FY 91-92	FY 92-93	FY 93-94	FY 94-95
UMTA SEC. 9 UMTA SEC. 3 OTHER FED.	5,010,768	9,700,708	13,252,160	10,695,014	11,256,678
LOCAL FUNDS SOURCE: BT	1,252,692	2,425,177	3,313,040	2,673,754	2,814,169
TOTAL FUNDS	6,263,460	12,125,885	14,905,420	13,368,768	14,070,847

7907a.39

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION WORKSHEET
For Projects Submitted For FY 90 - 91
of MTC's Transit Capital Priorities

1. OPERATOR: Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District

2. PROJECT NAME: AC 2 - Service Vehicle Replacement

3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Replace 12 Auto and Service Vehicles

4. PROJECT CLASS: (3) Service Vehicles

5. SRTP PAGE REFERENCE: 160 TIP PAGE REFERENCE: I-6-5

6. PROPOSED FEDERAL FUNDING: $ 165,440 UMTA Section 9

7. PROPOSED LOCAL MATCH: (20%) $ 41,360 Toll Bridge Revenue

8. TOTAL PROJECT COST: $ 206,800

9. PRIOR UMTA FUNDING: None

10. ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT TYPE AND STATUS:

NEPA STATUS: 23 CFR 771.117 (c)(17)
CEQA STATUS: 14 Cal Admin. Code, Section 15302

11. COMPLIANCE WITH PRIVATE SECTOR PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENTS (CIRCULAR NO. 7005.1):
(PLEASE COMPLETE FOR ANNUAL ELEMENT PROJECTS ONLY):

a. Was the private sector involved in the development of this project as set forth by your adopted policy?

_____ No. __X__ Yes: SRTP Page Reference Appendix K*

b. Were proposals received from the private sector to operate, construct, or otherwise provide all or part of the above named projects?

__X__ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, how were those proposals evaluated? Reference _____)

c. Are there impediments affecting your ability to contract for the above named project?

__X__ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, have you taken measures to address the impact of these impediments? Reference _____)

7907a.52

d. Have you received any formal complaints from the private sector regarding this project?

__X__ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, how have the complaints been addressed? Reference _____)

If proper references to the above questions are not contained in the SRTP, please elaborate under a separate heading as part of "12. PLANNING JUSTIFICATION" below.

12. PLANNING JUSTIFICATION:

*The Private Sector will be invited to comment on the above project at a public hearing held each year in conjunction with other regional transit operators and coordinated by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission. This public hearing is not referenced in our SRTP. Notification of this hearing is via newspaper ads and through a mailing to private sector providors.

The District's non-revenue Vehicle Replacement Program includes automobiles, trucks, vans and other motorized vehicles necessary to support bus service. To maintain a reliable non-revenue fleet that will effectively meet the future needs and requirements of the District, vehicles will be replaced at the end of their cost effective useful lives or when they have operated more than 100,000 miles. Many of the automobiles and service vehicles being replaced under this program exceed 100,000 miles. These vehicles have a history of continual and repeated maintenance problems. It is more cost effective for the District to replace these vehicles.

An even non-revenue vehicle replacement program calls for approximately 12 vehicle replacements each year. However, due to the scarcity of available funding, it is currently projected that funds will not be available to purchase vehicles in Fiscal Years 1991-92 and 1992-93. As a result, FY 1993-94 funding is being requested to purchase 36 non-revenue vehicles, including automobiles, fork lifts, special trucks and vans.

The District has an established and enforced non-revenue vehicle program which adheres to UMTA regulations regarding the use of non- revenue vehicles. Internal mechanisms effectively monitor the actual use of these vehicles and the District is prepared to certify that the vehicles purchased under federal funding will conform to UMTA procedures.

A. Continuation of Prior Commitment

1. This project is not a continuation of a funded multi-year project. However, non-revenue vehicle replacement is part of an annual ongoing project that the operator continues to assign high priority.

B. Project Merit

1. This project will directly benefit the passengers as a fleet of reliable non-revenue service vehicles is necessary to the adequate support of bus service.

2. This project will directly produce benefits to system productivity and efficiency through enabling the District to maintain a reliable fleet of non-revenue vehicles which will efficiently meet the future needs and requirements of the District transit system.

3. This project will not directly address significant or regional goals or policies.

4. This project will involve replacement service vehicles used in support of existing service according to a planned replacement program as previously noted.

7907a.54

IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE AND EXPENDITURE PLAN

Date: January 23, 1990

Project: AC2 - SERVICE VEHICLE REPLACEMENT

Operator: ALAMEDA-CONTRA COSTA TRANSIT DISTRICT

Beginning: FY 90-91

Initial Clearances Required:

IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE:	FY 90-91 YEAR 1 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 91-92 YEAR 2 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 92-93 YEAR 3 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 93-94 YEAR 4 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 94-95 YEAR 5 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4
TASK 1:APPROV. PURCH. COM.	XO			XO	XO
TASK 2: DEVELOP SPECS.	X			X	X
TASK 3: BOARD APPROVAL	XXO			XXO	XXO
TASK 4: BID PROCESS	XXXX			XXXX	XXXX
TASK 5: DELIV. PROCESS	XXX			XXX	XXX
TASK 6:SERV. PREPARATION	XX			XX	XX
TASK 7:					

O: Clearances and Approvals

EXPENDITURE PLAN (000$):	YEAR 1	YEAR 2	YEAR 3	YEAR 4	YEAR 5
UMTA SEC. 9	165,440			563,035	201,094
UMTA SEC. 3					
OTHER FED.					
LOCAL FUNDS SOURCE:B T	41,360			140,759	50,273
TOTAL FUNDS	206,800			703,794	251,367

7907a46

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION WORKSHEET
For Projects Submitted For FY 90 - 91
of MTC's Transit Capital Priorities

1. OPERATOR: Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District

2. PROJECT NAME: AC 3 - Replace Lifts

3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Replace non-reliable bus lifts

4. PROJECT CLASS: (2) Reconditioned Revenue Vehicles

5. SRTP PAGE REFERENCE: 160 TIP PAGE REFERENCE: I-6-5

6. PROPOSED FEDERAL FUNDING: $ 1,751,160 UMTA Section 9

7. PROPOSED LOCAL MATCH: (20%) $437,790 Toll Bridge Revenue

8. TOTAL PROJECT COST: $ 2,188,950

9. PRIOR UMTA FUNDING: None

10. ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT TYPE AND STATUS:

NEPA STATUS: 23 CFR 771.117 (c)(14)
CEQA STATUS: 14 Cal Admin. Code, Section 15302

11. COMPLIANCE WITH PRIVATE SECTOR PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENTS
(PLEASE COMPLETE FOR ANNUAL ELEMENT PROJECTS ONLY):

a. Was the private sector involved in the development on this project as set forth in your adopted policy?

_____ No. __X__ Yes: SRTP Page Reference Appendix K*

b. Were proposals received from the private sector to operate, construct, or otherwise provide all or part of the above named projects?

_____ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, how were those proposals evaluated? Reference _____)

c. Are there impediments affecting your ability to contract for the above named project?

_____ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, have you taken measures to address the impact of these impediments? Reference _____)

7905a.1

d. Have you received any formal complaints from the private sector regarding this project?

_____ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, how have the complaints been addressed? Reference _____)

12. PLANNING JUSTIFICATION:

Private Sector

*The Private Sector will be invited to comment on the above project at a public hearing held each year in conjunction with other regional transit operators and coordinated by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission. This public hearing is not referenced in our SRTP. Notification of this hearing is via newspaper ads and through a mailing to private sector providers.

More than half of AC Transit's buses are equipped with early-model wheelchair lifts which are past their useful life. This early equipment is not sufficiently reliable to engender confidence among users, nor to enable AC Transit to meet its commitment to its commitment to accessibility. The District has received substantial public criticism regarding the reliability of our wheelchair lifts, especially regarding several incidents in which patrons were injured as a result of malfunctioning lift equipment.

To address these problems and concerns, AC Transit has begun a lift-replacement program to improve the reliability of accessible service. As Phase I of the project, AC Transit is now in the process of contracting for the replacement of wheelchair lifts using UMTA Section 9 funding of approximately $1.4 million to replace approximately 110 lifts in the near future.

Phase II of this project calls for retrofitting an additional 175 wheelchair lifts during Fiscal Year 1990-91. This project, in conjunction with AC Transit's annual bus replacement plan, is intended to enable the District to approach its long-standing goal of a 100-percent lift-equipped fleet by 1992-93. This project will directly benefit the passengers as it will enable AC Transit to fulfill its work toward the state-mandated 98 percent accessibility rate. More reliable lifts will contribute to system productivity and efficiency and allow more timely service for the lift consumer.

A. Continuation of Prior Commitment

1. This project is Phase II of a two-phase multi-year project.

B. Project Merit

1. This project will directly benefit the passengers as it will enable the District to maintain a fleet of buses that are safe, reliable and accessible.

2. This project will directly produce benefits to system productivity and efficiency as the units replaced will be those that have shown themselves to be the most costly of the fleet to maintain at an appropriate service level.

3. This project will directly address a significant regional goal of Elderly & Handicapped accessibility.

4. This project will involve the replacement for maintaining existing service.

7905a.3

IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE AND EXPENDITURE PLAN

Date: January 24, 1990
Project: AC3 - LIFT IMPROVEMENT PROJECT
Operator: ALAMEDA-CONTRA COSTA TRANSIT DISTRICT
Beginning: FY 90-91
Initial Clearances Required:

IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE:	FY 88-89 YEAR 1 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 89-90 YEAR 2 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 90-91 YEAR 3 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 91-92 YEAR 4 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 92-93 YEAR 5 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4
TASK 1:COMPLETE ANALYSIS	XXXO		XXXO		
TASK 2: DEVELOP BID	XXXXO		XXXXO		
TASK 3: BID PROCESS	XXXO		XXXO		
TASK 4: IMPLEMENTATION	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX		XXXXXXXXXXXXXX	.	
TASK 5: TESTING	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX		XXXXXXXXXXXXXX		
TASK 6:					
TASK 7:					

O: Clearances and Approvals

EXPENDITURE PLAN (000$):	YEAR 1	YEAR 2	YEAR 3	YEAR 4	YEAR 5
UMTA SEC. 9	1,751,160		1,585,720		
UMTA SEC. 3					
OTHER FED.					
LOCAL FUNDS SOURCE:TOLL	437,790		396,430		
TOTAL FUNDS	2,188,950		1,982,150		

7907a45

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION WORKSHEET
For Projects Submitted For FY 90 - 91
of MTC's Transit Capital Priorities

1. OPERATOR: Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District

2. PROJECT NAME: AC5 - Oil Water Separators

3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Oil Water Separators to meet present water quality requirements.

4. PROJECT CLASS: (8) Operating Yards and Stations

5. SRTP PAGE REFERENCE: 164 TIP PAGE REFERENCE: I-6-6

6. PROPOSED FEDERAL FUNDING: $ 147,000 SOURCE: UMTA Section 9

7. PROPOSED LOCAL MATCH (20%):$ 36,750 SOURCE: Toll Bridge Revenues

8. TOTAL PROJECT COST:$ 183,750

9. PRIOR UMTA FUNDING: None

10. ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT TYPE AND STATUS:

NEPA STATUS: 23 CFR 771.117 (d) (9)
CEQA STATUS: 14 Cal. Admin. Code, Section 15301

11. COMPLIANCE WITH PRIVATE SECTOR PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENTS (CIRCULAR NO. 7005.1):
(PLEASE COMPLETE FOR ANNUAL ELEMENT PROJECTS ONLY):

a. Was the private sector involved in the development of this project as set forth by your adopted policy?

_____ No. __X__ Yes: SRTP Page Reference Appendix K*

b. Were proposals received from the private sector to operate, construct, or otherwise provide all or part of the above named projects?

__X__ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, how were those proposals evaluated? Reference _____)

c. Are there impediments affecting your ability to contract for the above named project?

__X__ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, have you taken measures to address the impact of these impediments? Reference _____)

d. Have you received any formal complaints from the private sector regarding this project?

__X__ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, how have the complaints been addressed? Reference _____)

If proper references to the above questions are not contained in the SRTP, please elaborate under a separate heading as part of "12. PLANNING JUSTIFICATION" below.

12. PLANNING JUSTIFICATION:

Private Sector

*The Private Sector will be invited to comment on the above project at a public hearing held each year in conjunction with other regional transit operators and coordinated by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission. This public hearing is not referenced in our SRTP. Notification of this hearing is via newspaper ads and through a mailing to private sector providers.

New rulings by the East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) and various municipalities have reduced the pollutants that may legally flow into the storm drains and industrial waste sewage systems. We are currently unable to meet these new requirements and are subject to being cited and fined. The acquisition of the oil/water separators will allow the District to comply with the new requirements.

An added incentive is the projected lowering of expense to the District since the oil/water separators will require less pumping out of pollutants to comply with the new regulations.

A. Continuation of Prior Commitment

1. This project will not be a continuation of a funded multi-year project.

B. Project Merit

1. This project will directly benefit the passengers as it will enable us to provide service with less possibility of major interruption.

2. This project will directly produce benefits to system productivity and efficiency as it will allow the District to conform to Federal, State and Local water quality requirements regarding pollutants that may legally flow into storm drains. This project will also cause a reduction in expenses for the District as less pumping out of pollutants will be required once the supplemental oil/water separators are implemented.

3. We believe that this project will enable the District to effectively address a significant Federal, State and Local goal, that being conformance to their water quality requirements.

4. This project will involve upgrade of equipment that has primary importance to maintaining existing service without major interruptions that might occur if the District were to be cited or fined for non-compliance.

7905a.7

IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE AND EXPENDITURE PLAN
Date: REVISED February 8, 1990
Project: AC5 - OIL WATER SEPARATORS
Operator: ALAMEDA-CONTRA COSTA TRANSIT DISTRICT
Beginning: FY 90-91
Initial Clearances Required: CITY PERMITS, IF APPLICABLE

IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE:	FY 90-91 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 91-92 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 92-93 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	YEAR Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	YEAR Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4
TASK 1: NEEDS ANALYSIS	XXXXXXXXX				
TASK 2:STAGING REPLACEMENTS/REPAIRS		XXXX			
TASK 3:BOARD APPROVAL/PROJECT REVIEW		XX			
TASK 4:DEV. & ISSUE SPECS./RFP		XXXXXX			
TASK 5:AWARD CONTRACTS			XXXX		
TASK 6:IMPLEM. REPLACEMENTS/REPAIRS			XXXXXXXX		
TASK 7:					

O: Clearances and Approvals

EXPENDITURE PLAN (000$):	FY 90-91	FY 91-92	FY 92-93	YEAR	YEAR
UMTA SEC. 9	147,000				
UMTA SEC. 3					
OTHER FED.					
LOCAL FUNDS SOURCE:B T	36,750				
TOTAL FUNDS	183,750				

7905a.9

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION WORKSHEET
For Projects Submitted For FY 1990/91
of MTC's Transit Capital Priorities

1. OPERATOR: Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District

2. PROJECT NAME: AC4 - Bus Fueling System

3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Conversion of buses and fuel islands to a Posi/Lock dry fueling system and the upgrading of the District's fueling islands.

4. PROJECT CLASS: (2) Reconditioned Revenue Vehicles

5. SRTP PAGE REFERENCE: 163-164 TIP PAGE REFERENCE: I-6-5

6. PROPOSED FEDERAL FUNDING: $672,000 SOURCE: UMTA Section 9

7. PROPOSED LOCAL MATCH (20%): $168,000 SOURCE: Toll Bridge Revenues

8. TOTAL PROJECT COST: $840,000

9. PRIOR UMTA FUNDING: none

10. ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT TYPE AND STATUS: (NR)

NEPA STATUS: 23 cfr 771.117c14
CEQA STATUS: 14 Cal.Admin.Code, Section 15301

11. COMPLIANCE WITH PRIVATE SECTOR PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENTS
(PLEASE COMPLETE FOR ANNUAL ELEMENT PROJECTS ONLY):

a. Was the private sector involved in the development on this project as set forth in your adopted policy?

_____ No. _X_ Yes: SRTP Page Reference Appendix K*

b. Were proposals received from the private sector to operate, construct, or otherwise provide all or part of the above named project?

_X_ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, how were those proposals evaluated? Reference _____)

c. Are there impediments affecting your ability to contract for the above named project?

_X_ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, have you taken measures to address the impact of these impediments? Reference _____)

7909a.1

d. Have you received any formal complaints from the private sector regarding this project?

_X_ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, how have the complaints been addressed? Reference _____

If proper references to the above questions are not constrained in the SRTP, please elaborate under a separate heading as part of "12. PLANNING JUSTIFICATION" below.

12. ADDITIONAL PLANNING JUSTIFICATION:

Private Sector

The Private Sector will be invited to comment on the above project at a public hearing held each year in conjunction with other regional transit operators and coordinated by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission. The public hearing is not referenced in our SRTP. Notification of this hearing is via newspaper ads and through a mailing to private sector providers.

Included in this project is:

- o The upgrading the District's fueling system (to be funded in FY 1990-91) to a Posi/Lock system at a cost of approximately $840,000, and
- o The upgrading of all of the District's fueling islands (proposed for funding in FY 93-94) to meet for the new "clean fuel" Federal regulations which currently apply to all buses purchased after 1991. The cost of this conversion will be approximately $4,500,000.

Fuel Losses (Posi/Lock System)

This project would upgrade the District's bus fueling system to a Posi/Lock system, which reduces the loss of fuel to spillage. Atlanta's MARTA system estimated savings of 6,000 gallons of fuel per week on a bus fleet about the same size as AC Transit's.

The Posi/Lock system also doubles the speed of flow from the present 15 gallons/minute to about 30 gallons/minute, and does not require special attention to "milk" the nozzle for complete filling, as the present system does. Both of these benefits amount to a saving of labor and time.

Additional benefits of the system include:

- o Reduction of spilled liquids, which present problems of containment and disposal under California law and AC Transit policy.
- o Possible savings in the area of claims by the elimination of the safety hazard presented by slippery spilled fuel.
- o Reduction of diesel smells in and around the buses, which often result from spilled fuel.

Clean Fuel Project

New Federal Regulations as currently stated will require all buses purchased after 1991 to be equipped with engines that utilize "clean fuels" which meet the new EPA requirements. While it is anticipated that there may be a decision to delay enforcement of the new regulations until 1994 when they also become applicable to truck operations, we feel we should be prepared to enhance our existing system to handle these new fueling needs.

A. Continuation of Prior Commitment

1. This project will not be a continuation of a funded multi-year project.

B. Project Merit

1. The project will directly produce benefits to system productivity and efficiency as it will allow more effective and efficient fueling of the bus fleet, and reduction of spilled fuel thus producing savings to the District in fuel and labor costs.

3. We believe that this project will enable the District to effectively address a significant Federal goal, that being implementation of the new "Clean Fuel" Federal regulations as well as a significant State goal, that being the reduction, containment and disposal of hazardous contaminants.

4. This project will involve replacement/upgrade of equipment that has primary importance to maintaining existing service, that being upgrading of the Distric't bus fuel systems and all the District's fuel islands.

IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE AND EXPENDITURE PLAN
Date: REVISED February 6, 1990
Project: AC4 - BUS FUELING SYSTEMS
Operator: ALAMEDA-CONTRA COSTA TRANSIT DISTRICT
Beginning: FY 90-91
Initial Clearances Required: CITY PERMITS, IF APPLICABLE

IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE:	FY 90-91 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 91-92 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 92-93 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 93-94 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 94-95 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4
TASK 1: NEEDS ANALYSIS	XXXXXXXXX		XXXXXXXX		
TASK 2:STAGING REPLACEMENTS/REPAIRS		XXXX		XXXX	
TASK 3:BOARD APPROVAL/PROJECT REVIEW		XX		XX	
TASK 4:DEV. & ISSUE SPECS./RFP		XXXXXX		XXXXXXX	
TASK 5:AWARD CONTRACTS			XXXX		XXXX
TASK 6:IMPLEM. REPLACEMENTS/REPAIRS			XXXXXXXX		XXXXXXXX
TASK 7:					

O: Clearances and Approvals

EXPENDITURE PLAN (000$):	FY 90-91	FY 91-92	FY 92-93	FY 93-94	FY 94-95
UMTA SEC. 9	672,000			3,600,000	
UMTA SEC. 3					
OTHER FED.					
LOCAL FUNDS SOURCE:BT	168,000			900,000	
TOTAL FUNDS	840,000			4,500,000	

7905a.50

SAN FRANCISCO / OAKLAND URBANIZED AREA
Designated Recipient: METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Grantee: BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT

UMTA SECTION 9 FUNDS PROGRAMMED	
FY 1990-91 Apportionment (Est.):	$64,277,064
FY 1989-90 Carryover Funds (Exp.):	370,008
TOTAL:	$64,647,072

PROGRAM OF PROJECTS
OPERATING ASSISTANCE

	UMTA Section 9 Funds	Local Match	FY 1990-91 Net Project Cost
BART *	$0	$119,098,800	$119,098,800

PROGRAM OF PROJECTS
CAPITAL PROJECTS

	UMTA Section 9 Funds	Local Match	Total FY 1990-91 Cost
BART			
Fruitvale A.I.P.	$800,000	$200,000	$1,000,000
Walnut Creek A.I.P.	800,000	200,000	1,000,000
	$1,600,000	$400,000	$2,000,000
TOTAL GRANTEE PROGRAM:	$1,600,000	$119,498,800	$121,098,800

* For the period July 1, 1990 to June 30, 1991.

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION WORKSHEET
For Projects Submitted For the Annual Element
of MTC's Transit Capital Priorities

1. OPERATOR: SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT

2. PROJECT NAME: FRUITVALE ACCESS IMPROVEMENTS (FRUITVAL.PJW)

3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION: First-year funding for this project provides for the design of bus transit interface improvements and approximately 560 parking spaces (including site replacement spaces) in a multi-level structure on BART-owned land.

4. PROJECT CLASS: 7

5. SRTP PAGE REFERENCE: PP 20-22 CIP TIP PAGE REFERENCE: I-6-9

6. PROPOSED FEDERAL FUNDING: $ 800,000 SOURCE: Section 9

7. PROPOSED LOCAL MATCH (20%): $ 200,000 SOURCE: Bridge Tolls

8. TOTAL PROJECT COST: $1,000,000

9. PRIOR UMTA FUNDING: None

10. ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT TYPE AND STATUS:

NEPA STATUS: Environmental Assessment per 23 CFR 771.119 et. seq. will be prepared during FY 1990-91
CEQA STATUS: Initial study per Guidelines Sec. 15603 will be prepared during FY 1990-91.

11. COMPLIANCE WITH PRIVATE SECTOR PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENTS (PLEASE COMPLETE FOR ANNUAL ELEMENT PROJECTS ONLY):

a. Was the private sector involved in the development on this project as set forth in your adopted policy?

__X__ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____

b. Were proposals received from the private sector to operate, construct, or otherwise provide all or part of the above named project?

_____ No. __X__ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, how were those proposals evaluated? Reference _____)

c. Are there impediments affecting your ability to contract for the above named project?

__X__ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, have you taken measures to address the impact of these impediments? Reference _____)

d. Have you received any formal complaints from the private sector regarding this project?

__X__ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, how have the complaints been addressed? Reference _____)

* Construction of this project will be contracted out following BART's formal bid procedures.

12. ADDITIONAL PLANNING JUSTIFICATION:

Existing intermodal transfer areas are shared by bus and auto modes. In addition, a significant portion of the parking access takes place on the same access roads. Presently, four bus bays are provided on site.

The proposed project will provide a minimum of twelve bus bays and the separation of the bus and auto access improving general circulation, as well as street circulation in the vicinity of the station. In additional, kiss/ride and bus bays would be separated, improving flow for both modes.

A sawtooth design for bus bays will provide independent berthing for all buses. Covered wait and walk areas would be provided at the bus access points along with improved signage and transit information. Other improvements will include landscaping. BART will explore the feasibility of direct bus to train access, which may include automatic ticket machines, transfer machines, bill/coin changer, and new fare gates. These improvements would be added to this scope of work if feasible and justified.

AC Transit is in the process of implementing a modified grid system throughout the central core of its service area (Oakland, Berkeley, Alameda, Albany, Emeryville, and Piedmont). There are some locations where several bus routes naturally converge creating the need to accommodate several buses at once and facilitate ease of transfer between buses. In the central core, Fruitvale Station must be improved before route restructuring can take place. It simply cannot accommodate the level of bus and transfer activity envisioned. The planned increase is from the current maximum of four simultaneous loadings up to a future twelve such loadings.

Significant restructuring of the existing parking lot is required to support improved multimodal access.

IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE AND EXPENDITURE PLAN

Date: January 30, 1990

Project: Fruitvale Access Improvements
Operator: SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT

Initial Clearances Required:

IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE:	FY 89/90 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 90/91 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 91/92 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 92/93 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4
EIR	===	=========		
Prepare RFP		===	===	
Bid/Award			O=======O	
Construction				==========

O: Clearances and Approvals
X000

EXPENDITURE PLAN (000$):	FY 90/91	FY 91/92	FY	FY
UMTA SEC. 9	800	9,490		
UMTA SEC. 3				
OTHER FED.				
STATE TP&D		1,186		
ARTICLE XIX				
RAIL BONDS				
PCL BONDS				
OTHER STATE				
LOCAL FUNDS				
SOURCE: BRIDGE TOLLS	200	1,186		
TOTAL FUNDS	1,000	11,862		

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION WORKSHEET
For Projects Submitted For the Annual Element
of MTC's Transit Capital Priorities

1. OPERATOR: SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT

2. PROJECT NAME: WALNUT CREEK ACCESS IMPROVEMENTS (WALCREEK.PJW)

3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION: First-year funding for this project provides for the design of bus transit interface improvements and approximately 1200 parking spaces (including site replacement spaces) in a multi-level structure on BART-owned land.

4. PROJECT CLASS: 7

5. SRTP PAGE REFERENCE: PP 20-22 CIP TIP PAGE REFERENCE: I-6-9

6. PROPOSED FEDERAL FUNDING: $ 800,000 SOURCE: Section 9

7. PROPOSED LOCAL MATCH (20%): $ 200,000 SOURCE: Bridge Tolls

8. TOTAL PROJECT COST: $1,000,000

9. PRIOR UMTA FUNDING: None

10. ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT TYPE AND STATUS:

NEPA STATUS: Environmental Assessment per 23 CFR 771.119 et. seq. will be prepared in FY 1990-91.
CEQA STATUS: Initial study per Guidelines Sec. 15063 will be prepared in FY 1990-91.

11. COMPLIANCE WITH PRIVATE SECTOR PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENTS
(PLEASE COMPLETE FOR ANNUAL ELEMENT PROJECTS ONLY):

a. Was the private sector involved in the development on this project as set forth in your adopted policy?

__X__ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____

b. Were proposals received from the private sector to operate, construct, or otherwise provide all or part of the above named project?

_____ No. __X__ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, how were those proposals evaluated? Reference _____)

c. Are there impediments affecting your ability to contract for the above named project?

__X__ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, have you taken measures to address the impact of these impediments? Reference _____)

d. Have you received any formal complaints from the private sector regarding this project?

__X__ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, how have the complaints been addressed? Reference _____)

* Construction of this project will be contracted out following BART's formal bid procedures.

12. ADDITIONAL PLANNING JUSTIFICATION:

Existing intermodal bus, kiss ride and parking access occur on the same two roads along the axis of the station platform.

The proposed project would provide for separate bus and kiss ride transfer areas, thus improving general circulation in the station. The physical configuration of the bus bays would be improved. Covered walkways and waiting areas would be provided at bus access points. There would be improvements in signage and schedule information. Major restructuring of the existing parking lot will be necessary to accommodate the multimodal access improvements. The project will include the following components:

1. Minimum of ten to twelve bus passenger loading platforms in an area dedicated to the exclusive use of buses only.

2. Adequate signage and public information to advise patrons regarding bus routes, timetables, and locations of bus routes.

3. All passenger walkways and waiting areas are to be covered and lit.

4. All facilities are to be fully accessible to the disabled, including wheelchair-bound passengers.

5. The bus loading zone area should be exclusive for buses.

6. Final design configuration of the bus access improvements are subject to review by CCCTA.

Additional bus bays/loading zones are needed to accommodate simultaneous arrivals/departures of buses. Currently , the level of service is such that the available bays are insufficient and conflicts arise.

Over the next five to seven years, CCCTA expects to reduce headways on nearly all routes serving Walnut Creek Station. Most routes serving Walnut Creek Station are now at 30-minute headways . By the mid 1990's, the headways on their routes will be between 10-15 minutes. This increased level of service implies that there will be additional conflicts at the station if no more bays/loading zones are provided.

CCCTA also expects to add approximately two more routes serving Walnut Creek by 1992/93. These new routes would serve the San Ramon Valley as well as provide a link to Lafayette and Orinda.

IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE AND EXPENDITURE PLAN

Date: January 30, 1990

Project: Walnut Creek Access Improvements
Operator: SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT

Initial Clearances Required:

IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE:	FY 89/90 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 90/91 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 91/92 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 92/93 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4
EIR	===	=========		
Prepare RFP		===	===	
Bid/Award			O=======O	
Construction				==========

O: Clearances and Approvals

X 000

EXPENDITURE PLAN (000$):	FY 90/91	FY 91/92	FY	FY
UMTA SEC. 9	800	13,307		
UMTA SEC. 3				
OTHER FED.				
STATE TP&D		1,663		
ARTICLE XIX				
RAIL BONDS				
PCL BONDS				
OTHER STATE				
LOCAL FUNDS SOURCE: BRIDGE TOLLS	200	1,664		
TOTAL FUNDS	1,000	16,634		

7906a

SAN FRANCISCO / OAKLAND URBANIZED AREA
Designated Recipient: METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Grantee: CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (FOR CALTRAIN)

UMTA SECTION 9 FUNDS PROGRAMMED	
FY 1990-91 Apportionment (Est.):	$64,277,064
FY 1989-90 Carryover Funds (Exp.):	370,008
TOTAL:	$64,647,072

PROGRAM OF PROJECTS
OPERATING ASSISTANCE

	UMTA Section 9 Funds	Local Match	FY 1990-91 Net Project Cost
CalTrain *	$586,221	$8,978,062	$9,564,283

PROGRAM OF PROJECTS
CAPITAL PROJECTS

	UMTA Section 9 Funds	Local Match	Total FY 1990-91 Cost
CalTrain			
Accessibility (SFO)	$3,372,932	$1,331,233	$4,704,165
Ticket Vending Equipment (SFO)	1,166,497	291,624	1,458,121
SF Terminal Extension (SFO)	1,312,500	7,203,125	8,515,625
	$5,851,929	$8,825,982	$14,677,911
TOTAL GRANTEE PROGRAM:	$6,438,150	$17,804,044	$24,242,194

* For the period July 1, 1990 to June 30, 1991.

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION WORKSHEET
For Projects Submitted For FY 91/97
of MTC's Transit Capital Priorities

1. OPERATOR: Caltrans/JPB

2. PROJECT NAME: Wheelchair Accessibility

3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Install wheelchair lifts on 21 passenger cars to make CalTrain accessible to elderly and handicapped patrons.

4. PROJECT CLASS: (2) Reconditioned Revenue Vehicles

5. SRTP PAGE REFERENCE: II-8 TIP PAGE REFERENCE: I-6-18

6. PROPOSED FEDERAL FUNDING: $5,000,000 ($3,372,932 SF/O UZA; $1,627,068 SJ UZA) SOURCE: Section 9

7. PROPOSED LOCAL MATCH (26%): $1,738,000 SOURCE: PVEA/PEAF

8. TOTAL PROJECT COST: $6,738,000

9. PRIOR UMTA FUNDING: none

10. ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT TYPE AND STATUS: (NR)

NEPA STATUS: 23 cfr 771.117a; c15
CEQA STATUS: Cal.Admin.Code, Section 15302

11. COMPLIANCE WITH PRIVATE SECTOR PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENTS (PLEASE COMPLETE FOR ANNUAL ELEMENT PROJECTS ONLY):

a. Was the private sector involved in the development on this project as set forth in your adopted policy?

_____ No. _X_ Yes: SRTP Page Reference Appendix ____

b. Were proposals received from the private sector to operate, construct, or otherwise provide all or part of the above named project?

_X_ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, how were those proposals evaluated? Reference _____)

c. Are there impediments affecting your ability to contract for the above named project?

_X_ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, have you taken measures to address the impact of these impediments? Reference _____)

d. Have you received any formal complaints from the private sector regarding this project?

_X_ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, how have the complaints been addressed? Reference _____

If proper references to the above questions are not constrained in the SRTP, please elaborate under a separate heading as part of "12. PLANNING JUSTIFICATION" below.

12. ADDITIONAL PLANNING JUSTIFICATION:

As part of the station improvement program, Caltrans has been studying methods of making the Peninsula Commute Service accessible to wheelchairs. Caltrns initial accessibility study titled "Peninsula Commute Rail Service Accessibility Study" was completed in February 1987. The study recommended construction of "mini-high" platforms at stations, with access through the vestibule doors. SP, as operator of the service, expressed concerns over this recommendation because of operational problems. Recently, an on-board lift has proven to be successful on the San Diego Light Rail system and both SP and Caltrans feel it has application to the PCS. Caltrans is planning a demonstration project that would test the on-board lift on the PCS. As part of this accessibility project, Caltrans plans to also make the restroom on-board the train accessible to wheelchairs.

Caltrans will be testing two alternatives for accessibility: (1) retrofit existing cab-control car with wheelchair lift and modify existing restroom to make it accessible; and (2) retrofit an existing trailer car with wheelchair lift and add an accessible restroo. Lifts from two different manufacturers will be tested on each car; one on each side of the train. A consultant will be retained to develop the testing and evaluation procedures. Based on the consultant's evaluation and recommendation following the demonstration project, a decision will be made whether to retrofit the remaining 20 cab-control cars or 20 passenger trailer cars with the preferred lifting mechanism.

The demonstration project, including the performance evaluation, is expected to cost $1,530,000. Caltrans has requested a Letter of No Prejudice from UMTA to expend local funds to initiate the demonstrtion phase of the project without jeopardizing Federal Section 9 funds requested in FY 1990/91.

The Sumitomo Corportion, manufacturer of the CalTrain passenger cars, has estimated that it will cost approximately $4.6 million to retrofit the remaining 20 cab-control cars with accessibility features and $5.2 million to retrofit 20 trailer cars. Therefore, Caltrans is seeking to program $6.7 million ($5.0 million Section 9, $1.7 million State and Local matching funds) in FY 1990/91 to complete the accessibility project. Local Petroleum Violation Escrow Account funds (PVEA) and State Passenger Equipment Acquisition Fund (PEAF) monies have already been committed to the project. Caltrans is also seeking TCI funds to complete the project.

7909a.19

IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE AND EXPENDITURE PLAN
Date: 19-Jul-90

Project: Wheelchair Accessibility
Operator: CalTrain

Initial Clearances Required:

IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE:	FY 90-91 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 91-92 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 92-93 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 93-94 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4
TASK 1: Demo Retrofit 2 cars	9 months			
TASK 2: Demo Evaluation	6 months			
TASK 3: Contract Process		3 months		
TASK 4: Retrofit 20 cars			16 months	

o: Clearances and Approvals

EXPENDITURE PLAN (000$):	FY 90-91	FY 91-92	FY 92-93	FY 93-94
UMTA Section 9		1,875	3,125	
UMTA Section 3				
Other Federal				
Article XIX				
TP&D				
108 Rail Bonds				
116 Rail Bonds				
Other State	1,530 (LONP)	78	130	
Local Funds (source:)				
TOTAL FUNDS:	1,530	1,953	3,255	0

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION WORKSHEET
For Projects Submitted For FY 90/91
of MTC's Transit Capital Priorities

1. OPERATOR: Caltrans/JPB

2. PROJECT NAME: Ticket Vending Machine Acquisition

3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Purchase and install Automatic Ticket Vending Machines at all 26 stations and the proposed Alma Avenue Station.

4. PROJECT CLASS: (12) Revenue Collection and Processing

5. SRTP PAGE REFERENCE: III-7 TIP PAGE REFERENCE: I-6-18

6. PROPOSED FEDERAL FUNDING: $5,020,813 SOURCE: Section 9
(FY 90/91 $1,166,497)

7. PROPOSED LOCAL MATCH (20%): $1, 255,203 SOURCE: State/Local
(FY 90/91 $291,624)

8. TOTAL PROJECT COST: $6,276,016
(FY 90/91 $1,458,121)

9. PRIOR UMTA FUNDING: none

10. ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT TYPE AND STATUS: (NR)

NEPA STATUS: 23 cfr 771.117a; c19
CEQA STATUS: Cal.Admin.Code, Section 15301(a)(c)

11. COMPLIANCE WITH PRIVATE SECTOR PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENTS
(PLEASE COMPLETE FOR ANNUAL ELEMENT PROJECTS ONLY):

a. Was the private sector involved in the development on this project as set forth in your adopted policy?

_____ No. _X_ Yes: SRTP Page Reference Appendix ____

b. Were proposals received from the private sector to operate, construct, or otherwise provide all or part of the above named project?

_X_ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, how were those proposals evaluated? Reference _____)

c. Are there impediments affecting your ability to contract for the above named project?

_X_ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, have you taken measures to address the impact of these impediments? Reference _____)

d. Have you received any formal complaints from the private sector regarding this project?

_X_ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, how have the complaints been addressed? Reference _____

If proper references to the above questions are not constrained in the SRTP, please elaborate under a separate heading as part of "12. PLANNING JUSTIFICATION" below.

12. ADDITIONAL PLANNING JUSTIFICATION:

In June 1989, Price Waterhouse under contract to Caltrans, completed a fare study entitled, "San Francisco - San Jose Rail Tariff Study." In the report, the consultant recommended conversion to a barrier-free proof-of-payment fare collection system similar to the San Diego, Santa Clara and Sacramento Light Rail systems. Under this system, tickets would be purchased through ticket vending machines at stations and randomly inspected by authorized personnel onboard trains. The need for ticket agents at stations and conductors would, therefore, be eliminated. Conductor personnel could be used, instead, to inspect tickets, on a random basis, for proper payment. Full implementation of a proof-of-payment fare collection system is expected to reduce operating costs by $2.1 million annually.

Even without immediate implementation of a full barrier-free system, installation of ticket vending machines would provide an added passenger convenience, particularly at stations that are currently unmanned, and would reduce the ticket selling responsibilities of conductors, allowing them additional time to check tickets. This may reduce the need for helper conductors on trains with heavy passenger loads.

As a result of the fare study's recommendations, Caltrans hired a consultant to prepare specifications for ticket vending machines. The machines specified by the consultant will include the following features: credit/debit card acceptance, magnetic encoding capabilities, data collection (including ridership and fare data), and security alarms and lighting. The machines will be capable of dispensing all tickets currently used by the PCS. In addition, the existing monthly ticket with a Peninsula Pass will be issued as a magnetically encoded credit card-size ticket, compatible with MUNI and BART (within San Francisco) fare gates. The machines will be capable of dispensing all tickets currently used by the PCS. In addition, the existing monthly ticket with a Peninsula Pass will be issued as a magnetically encoded credit card-size ticket, compatible with MUNI and BART (within San Francisco) fare gates. The machines will also include provisions for issuing magnetically encoded stored value tickets for future coordination with BART. This has important regional fare coordination implications. In addition, at Santa Clara County Transit's request, Caltrans has amended the specifications to allow purchase of a local bus/light rail transfer in conjunctions to allow purchase of a local bus/light rail transfer in conjunction with a train ticket in all three counties served by the PCS. This would allow passengers to complete a multi-mode transit trip with one ticket.

The TVM specifications, which have been completed, will be used to procure the machines. Caltrans intends to purchase 66 machines (a minimum of two machines will be installed at each of the 26 stations), 29 separate stand-alone validators, necessary computer equipment and a maintenance contract (see cost estimates on following page).

Besides the obvious passenger benefits, Caltrans believes that it is imperative to acquire the TVMs as soon as possible because extentions currently planned for the PCS will not have staffed stations. No plans have been made for a ticket agent at the proposed Alma Avenue station, which is expected to be completed in late 1991. Installation of ticket vending machines at this station would be much more cost effective than hiring an additional station agent. Similarly, plans for the service extension to Gilroy, sponsored by Santa Clara County, do not include station agents at the eight (8) proposed stations. Adding station agents would increase operating costs for this extension dramatically.

Caltrans plans to test passenger acceptance and machine reliability by installing eleven machines initially. Caltrans is requesting $1,166,497 in FY 1990/91 UMTA Section 9 funds to be matched with $291,624 in State and Local funds to finance the purchase and installation of three (3) machines at the proposed Alma Avenue station, four (4) at the San Francisco Station, two (2) at an intermediate station in San Mateo County and two (2) at an intermediate station in Santa Clara County. Caltrans plans to award a contract for manufacture of the machines in January 1991. Design, production, and installation is expected to take 12 months, with installation expected by the end of 1991 to coincide with the opening of the Ala Avenue Station. Caltrans is requesting funding ($3,854,316 UMTA Section 9, and $963,579 State and local match) in FY 1993/94 to purchase the remaining 55 machines.

Cost estimates for both phases of this project in 1990 dollars are as follows:

Description:	Quantity	Unit Price	Total
Engineering, Project Mgt. & Software Development			$450,000
Ticket Vending Machine	66	$55,000	$3,630,000
Stand Alone Validator	29	5,000	145,000
Central Computer (Main)	1	24,000	24,000
Computer Terminal	3	8,000	8,000
Computer Printer (Laser)	2	4,000	8,000
Ticket Stock			40,000
O&M Manuals			150,000
Training			40,000
Spare Parts			346,000
Special Test Equipment			43,500
Ticket Vending Machine Installation			63,000
Stand Alone Validator Installation			6,500
First Three Years of Maintenance			650,000
	TOTAL		$5,620,000

Estimated costs to be incurred during Phase I of the project are as follows:

	Quantity	Unit Price	Total
Engineering			$450,000
Ticket Vending Machines	11	$55,000	$605,000
Central Computer	1	$24,000	24,000
Computer Terminal	1	8,000	8,000
Computer Printer	1	4,000	4,000
O&M Manuals			$136,520
Training			6,800
Spare Parts			58,800
Special Test Equipment			43,500
TVM Installation		1,000	11,000
Maintenance			110,500
		TOTAL	$1,458,120

7909a.17

IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE AND EXPENDITURE PLAN
Date: November 30, 1989

Project: Ticket Vending Machine Acquisition
Operator: Caltrans/JPB

Initial Clearances Required:

IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE:	FY 90/91 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 91/92 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 92/93 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 93/94 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4
TASK 1: Spec. Dev.	Completed			
TASK 2: Contract Proc	------			
TASK 3: Contract Award	-- (Jan '91)			
TASK 4: Design & Production	(11 TVMs)---------- (10 months)			(55 TVMs)--- (6 mos)
TASK 5: Installation		-- (Dec '91)		-- (3 mo)

C: Clearances and Approvals

EXPENDITURE PLAN (000S):	FY 90/91	FY 91/92	FY 92/93	FY 93/94
UMTA SEC. 9	1,166			3,854
UMTA SEC. 3				
OTHER FED.				
STATE TP&D	146			482
ARTICLE XIX				
RAIL BONDS				
PCL BONDS				
OTHER STATE				
LOCAL FUNDS				
SOURCE:	146			482
TOTAL FUNDS	1,458			4,818

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION WORKSHEET
For Projects Submitted For FY 1990/91 & 93/94
of MTC's Transit Capital Priorities

1. OPERATOR: Caltrans

2. PROJECT NAME: San Francisco Terminal Relocation

3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The proposed project is to relocate the PCS's downtown terminal station to better serve the transit patron.

4. PROJECT CLASS: (6) Passenger Stations

5. SRTP PAGE REFERENCE: III-16 TIP PAGE REFERENCE: I-6-19

6. PROPOSED FEDERAL FUNDING: $2,500,000 ($1,312,500 SF/O UZA; $1,187,500 SJ UZA) SOURCE: UMTA Sections 3 and 9

7. PROPOSED LOCAL MATCH (75%): $7,500,000 SOURCE: State Rail Bond Funds, SMCTA and Local Operators

8. TOTAL PROJECT COST: $10,000,000

9. PRIOR UMTA FUNDING: none

10. ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT TYPE AND STATUS: (NR)

NEPA STATUS: EIS pending
CEQA STATUS: EIR pending

11. COMPLIANCE WITH PRIVATE SECTOR PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENTS
(PLEASE COMPLETE FOR ANNUAL ELEMENT PROJECTS ONLY):

a. Was the private sector involved in the development on this project as set forth in your adopted policy?

_____ No. __X__ Yes: SRTP Page Reference __Appendix__

b. Were proposals received from the private sector to operate, construct, or otherwise provide all or part of the above named project?

__x__ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, how were those proposals evaluated? Reference _____)

c. Are there impediments affecting your ability to contract for the above named project?

__x__ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, have you taken measures to address the impact of these impediments? Reference _____)

7909a.7

7909a

d. Have you received any formal complaints from the private sector regarding this project?

_x_ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, how have the complaints been addressed? Reference _____

If proper references to the above questions are not constrained in the SRTP, please elaborate under a separate heading as part of "12. PLANNING JUSTIFICATION" below.

12. ADDITIONAL PLANNING JUSTIFICATION:

The PCS is the commuter rail system that currently services the San Francisco Peninsula between San Jose and the existing terminal station in San Francisco located at Fourth and Townsend.

The present condition of the terminal at its Fourth & Townsend Street site (at grade) is not considered desirable either from transportation or land use/public planning perspectives and is not consistent with the proposed Mission Bay Plan in San Francisco.

In September 1988, the JPB initiated an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/EIR) in compliance with the Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA), the California Quality Act (CEQA) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). This UMTA sanctioned study, is analyzing alternative site locations in terms of capital and operating costs, patronage projections, and environmental impacts. The overall objective of the study is to identify a cost-effective and desirable location for the PCS's downtown terminal station so that it best serves the transit patrons, most of whom are designed to the downtown San Francisco. A draft report for public and agency review is expected in April 1990. At that time, a preferred alternative will be selected.

In March 1988, a regional concensus was reached on MTC'S New Rail Starts and Extensions Program. This program (Res. No. 1876) includes the San Francisco Terminal Relocation Project and a proposed agreement to fund the project. Federal funds will be sought for approximately twenty-five percent of the project costs. The remaining funds will come from State Rail Bonds (assuming passage in June 1990) and the San Mateo County Transportation Authority.

A meeting was held with TOCC and Washington, D.C. representatives on January 24, 1990 where agreement was reached to finance preliminary engineering using UMTA Section 9 funds.

SAN FRANCISCO / OAKLAND URBANIZED AREA
Designated Recipient: METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Grantee: CENTRAL CONTRA COSTA TRANSIT DISTRICT

UMTA SECTION 9 FUNDS PROGRAMMED	
FY 1990–91 Apportionment (Est.):	$64,277,064
FY 1989–90 Carryover Funds (Exp.):	370,008
TOTAL:	$64,647,072

PROGRAM OF PROJECTS
OPERATING ASSISTANCE

	UMTA Section 9 Funds	Local Match	FY 1990–91 Net Project Cost
CCCTA *	$1,272,538	$10,236,000	$11,508,538

PROGRAM OF PROJECTS
CAPITAL PROJECTS

	UMTA Section 9 Funds	Local Match	Total FY 1990–91 Cost
CCCTA			
Maintenance Shop Equipment	$254,770	$63,693	$318,463
Bus Rehabilitation I (engines)	358,400	89,600	448,000
Bus Rehabilitation II (a.c.,interiors)	350,933	87,733	438,666
	$964,103	$241,026	$1,205,129
TOTAL GRANTEE PROGRAM:	$2,236,641	$10,477,026	$12,713,667

* For the period July 1, 1990 to June 30, 1991.

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION WORKSHEET
For Projects Submitted For FY 1990-91
of MTC's Transit Capital Priorities

1. OPERATOR: Central Contra Costa Transit Authority

2. PROJECT NAME: CC35 Maintenance Shop Equipment

3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Purchase of repair, diagnostic, and service equipment to be installed and used at CCCTA maintenance facility, bus wash area, and vehicle storage pad. Equipment is predominately either for replacement of existing equipment or ehnancement of current maintenance and service functions.

4. PROJECT CLASS: Vehicle Maintenance Shops and Garage

5. SRTP PAGE REFERENCE: Pg. III-7 TIP PAGE REFERENCE: I-6-23

6. PROPOSED FEDERAL FUNDING: $254,770 SOURCE: Section 9

7. PROPOSED LOCAL MATCH (20%): $63,693 SOURCE: Toll Bridge Revenues

8. TOTAL PROJECT COST: $318,463

9. PRIOR UMTA FUNDING: none

10. ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT TYPE AND STATUS:

NEPA STATUS: 23 cfr 771.117c19
CEQA STATUS: 14 Cal.Admin.Code, Section 15301

11. COMPLIANCE WITH PRIVATE SECTOR PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENTS (CIRCULAR 7005.1)
(PLEASE COMPLETE FOR ANNUAL ELEMENT PROJECTS ONLY):

a. Was the private sector involved in the development on this project as set forth in your adopted policy?

_____ No. _X_ Yes: SRTP Page Reference SRTP Page Reference

b. Were proposals received from the private sector to operate, construct, or otherwise provide all or part of the above named project?

___ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, how were those proposals evaluated? Reference _____)

c. Are there impediments affecting your ability to contract for the above named project?

_X_ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, have you taken measures to address the impact of these impediments? Reference _____)

7909a.4

d. Have you received any formal complaints from the private sector regarding this project?

__ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, how have the complaints been addressed? Reference _____

If proper references to the above questions are not constrained in the SRTP, please elaborate under a separate heading as part of "12. PLANNING JUSTIFICATION" below.

12. ADDITIONAL PLANNING JUSTIFICATION:

The maintenance and service equipment included in this project have been identified by the CCCTA Operations and Maintenance Departments as essential to maintaining or improving existing levels of vehicle performance, functional productivity, and worker safety. The equipment generally represents either:

- necessary replacements for existing equipment which is either outmoded or is projected to be past its useful life by the program year,

or

- enhancements to existing maintenance or service functions made necessary and/or desirable to the completion of CCCTA permanent maintenance facility, introduction of proper equipment is necessary.

  - o bus vacuum
  - o bus washer
  - o bus engine analyzer
  - o fuel management system

Acquisition of the equipment underlying this project will result in the following direct benefits to passengers.

- improved maintenance equipment and maintenance functionality attending this project will provide greater revenue vehicle reliability. The equipment requested is designed to support a long-term improvement in the number of miles between road calls. In-service breakdowns cause severe inconvenience to on-board passengers as well as to passengers waiting for down-the-line pick-up.

- improved maintenance equipment and maintenance functionality attending this project will allow CCCTA to reduce its spare ratio. A smaller spare ratio will permit CCCTA to provide more peak buses in service without expanding overall fleet size. Greater availability of peak-hour buses will permit CCCTA to offer passengers greater service frequencies (less waiting) and expanded route coverage (extended geographical coverage).

- improved service equipment and service functionality attending this project will permit faster and more complete servicing of the CCCTA bus fleet.

Replacement of enhancement of existing maintenance and service equipment will support greater productivity among maintenance mechanics and service workers. The requested equipment will permit faster and more effective completion of the following maintenance and service functions.

- o Permit faster interior cleaning of Authority buses by adding a second bus interior vacuum and exterior wash unit to be installed in existing second service/cleaning lane. The second service/cleaning lane cannot currently be used for interior/exterior cleaning due to lack of the equipment. The second land was designed into CCCTA permanent facility in order to accommodate future expanded fleet size. This enhancement will permit faster interior cleaning of the full bus fleet, reducing bus down time, and making more vehicles available for revenue service at any given time.

  Permit in-house accurate monitoring of fuel usage at the individual vehicle and route level; will provide important data related to vehicle performance measurement; will permit fast and accurate transmission of fuel usage data into existing QANTEL minicomputer system in use by Maintenance Department; will contribute to fuel waste reductions.

The equipment described in this project is needed to support CCCTA's effort to establish an acceptable basic level of service. The equipment used in this project is to be used to complement the design and function of the new, permanent maintenance facility in order to create an efficient and effective maintenance and service program. Such a program is essential to provision of reliable transit service program, maximum utilization of available revenue vehicles, and extended life of capital resources. The equipment described in this project are essential to an effective maintenance and service program regardless of whether or not CCCTA chooses to expand its revenue vehicle fleet beyond current levels.

Note: This project should be given special consideration within the guidelines established for projecting the capital needs of new transit operators. These guidelines were established during development of the MTC Capital Priorities process.

IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE AND EXPENDITURE PLAN

Date: November 30, 1989

Project: CC35 MAINTENANCE SHOP EQUIPMENT
Operator: CCCTA

Initial Clearances Required: BOARD APPROVAL

IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE:	FY 91 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 92 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 93 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 94 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4
TASK 1: DEVELOP SPECS	------			
TASK 2: PROCURE/ AWARD BID	----O			
TASK 3: DELIVERY/ INSTALL		-----		
TASK 4:				

O: Clearances and Approvals

EXPENDITURE PLAN (000$):	FY 91	FY 92	FY 93	FY 94
UMTA SEC. 9		255.0		
UMTA SEC. 3				
OTHER FED.				
STATE TP&D				
ARTICLE XIX				
RAIL BONDS				
PCL BONDS				
OTHER STATE				
LOCAL FUNDS SOURCE:TOLLS		64.0		
TOTAL FUNDS	0.0	319.0	0.0	0.0

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION WORKSHEET
For Projects Submitted For FY 90/91
of MTC's Transit Capital Priorities

1. OPERATOR: Central Contra Costa Transit Authority

2. PROJECT NAME: Recondition 14 Flyer Buses (Phase I)

3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Phase I of reconditioning 14 Flyer buses that will have been in service 12 years by the project year. Project includes reconditioning the engines, transmissions, exhausts, suspensions, interiors, fareboxes, headsigns, wheelchair lifts, radios, and air conditioning units. Project to span two fiscal years. This is Phase I which consists of reconditioning the engines. Phase II is to take place in fiscal year 1991 and will cover the rest of the project.

4. PROJECT CLASS: Reconditioned Revenue Vehicles

5. SRTP PAGE REFERENCE: TIP PAGE REFERENCE: I-6-23

6. PROPOSED FEDERAL FUNDING: $358,400 SOURCE: UMTA Section 9

7. PROPOSED LOCAL MATCH (20%): $89,600 SOURCE: Bridge Tolls

8. TOTAL PROJECT COST: $448,000

9. PRIOR UMTA FUNDING: None

10. ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT TYPE AND STATUS:

NEPA STATUS: 23 CFR 771.117(c) 17
CEQA STATUS: 14 Cal. Admin. Code, Section 15302

11. COMPLIANCE WITH PRIVATE SECTOR PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENTS (CIRCULAR No. 7005.1): (PLEASE COMPLETE FOR ANNUAL ELEMENT PROJECTS ONLY):

a. Was the private sector involved in the development on this project as set forth in your adopted policy?

__X__ No. ___ Yes: SRTP Page Reference ___IV-80___

b. Were proposals received from the private sector to operate, construct, or otherwise provide all or part of the above named project?

_X_ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, how were those proposals evaluated? Reference _____)

c. Are there impediments affecting your ability to contract for the above named project?

_X_ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, have you taken measures to address the impact of these impediments? Reference _____)

7909a.32

d. Have you received any formal complaints from the private sector regarding this project?

____ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, how have the complaints been addressed? Reference _____

If proper references to the above questions are not constrained in the SRTP, please elaborate under a separate heading as part of "12. PLANNING JUSTIFICATION" below.

12. ADDITIONAL PLANNING JUSTIFICATION:

Routine replacement or reconditioning of CCCTA's revenue fleet is essential to the efficient, safe, and reliable provision of local mass transit services. The 14 Flyer buses being reconditioned were purchased in 1981 by AC Transit and put into service, by CCCTA, in 1983. By fiscal year 1992-93, they will have been in service 12 years. Normally a bus reaches the end of its useful life after 12 years. However, this particular reconditioning program will allow the 14 Flyers to continue providing efficient and reliable service for an additional six years. In this particular instance, bus reconditioning is preferable to bus replacement.

By extending the life of the 14 Flyers by six years, the cost to CCCTA will be $11,803 per bus/per year compared to $17,422 per bus/per year for a bus replacement project. Also, further savings will result from a streamlined spare power components inventory. This is because CCCTA, through reconditioning the Flyers, will have the same engines on all its buses. This will allow CCCTA or the Region to benefit by applying the savings to other worthy programs. To fund Phase II of this project in fiscal year 1992, CCCTA proposed to use $460,600 of the $42,926,937 CCCTA has programmed in fiscal year 1992 to replace the 14 Flyers.

Phase I involves replacing existing engines in the 14 Flyers with state-of-the-art electronic engines. This involves installing component replacement engines and the conversion of the existing transmissions to match the new engines.

Phase II involves restoring the interiors with new seats and floor coverings as well as repainting each coach and replacing the air conditioning systems. Phase II is to take place in fiscal year 1991.

There is another value in reconditioning the 14 Flyers in that they are the real workhorses of the CCCTA fleet. These older heavy duty buses are better built and able to sustain heavy passenger loads. The frames, suspension, and body construction of these coaches are of such quality that CCCTA is reluctant to dispose of this asset. By replacing the power systems, air conditioning systems, and repainting the interiors and replacing the seats of these coaches, CCCTA will be able to continue operating these well-built, safe, and reliable buses.

Without reconditioning the 14 Flyers, CCCTA will not have enough revenue vehicles to meet its level of service demand. With timely reconditioning of the 14 buses, CCCTA can continue to operate efficient, safe, and reliable bus service that is not subject to disruption and patron inconvenience because of breakdowns and roadcalls.

IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE AND EXPENDITURE PLAN

Date: January 30, 1990
Project: Recondition 14 Buses (Phase I)
Operator: CCCTA
Initial Clearances Required: EIR (R), O&S Committee Approval, Board Approval

IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE:	FY 91 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 92 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 93 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 94 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4
TASK 1: Develop Specs	--O			
TASK 2: Procure/Award Bid	----O			
TASK 3: Delivery/ Install	---O			
TASK 4:				

O: Clearances and Approvals

EXPENDITURE PLAN (000$):	FY 91	FY 92	FY 93	FY 94
UMTA SEC. 9	358.4			
UMTA SEC. 3				
OTHER FED.				
STATE TP&D				
ARTICLE XIX				
RAIL BONDS				
PCL BONDS				
OTHER STATE				
LOCAL FUNDS SOURCE: STA	89.6			
OP				
TOTAL FUNDS	448.0			

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION WORKSHEET
For Projects Submitted For FY 90/91
of MTC's Transit Capital Priorities

1. OPERATOR: Central Contra Costa Transit Authority

2. PROJECT NAME: Recondition 14 Flyer Buses (Phase II)

3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Phase I of reconditioning 14 Flyer buses that will have been in service 12 years by the project year. Project includes reconditioning the engines, transmissions, exhausts, suspensions, interiors, fareboxes, headsigns, wheelchair lifts, radios, and air conditioning units. Project to span two fiscal years. This is Phase II which consists of reconditioning the interiors, fareboxes, headsigns, wheelchair lifts, radios, and air conditioning units.

4. PROJECT CLASS: Reconditioned Revenue Vehicles

5. SRTP PAGE REFERENCE: TIP PAGE REFERENCE: I-6-23

6. PROPOSED FEDERAL FUNDING: $350,933 SOURCE: UMTA Section 9

7. PROPOSED LOCAL MATCH (20%): $87,733 SOURCE: Bridge Tolls

8. TOTAL PROJECT COST: $438,666

9. PRIOR UMTA FUNDING: None

10. ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT TYPE AND STATUS:

NEPA STATUS: 23 CFR 771.117(c)(17)
CEQA STATUS: 14 Cal. Admin. Code, Section 15302

11. COMPLIANCE WITH PRIVATE SECTOR PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENTS (CIRCULAR No. 7005.1): (PLEASE COMPLETE FOR ANNUAL ELEMENT PROJECTS ONLY):

a. Was the private sector involved in the development on this project as set forth in your adopted policy?

__X__ No. ___ Yes: SRTP Page Reference __IV-80____

b. Were proposals received from the private sector to operate, construct, or otherwise provide all or part of the above named project?

__X__ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, how were those proposals evaluated? Reference _____)

c. Are there impediments affecting your ability to contract for the above named project?

__X__ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, have you taken measures to address the impact of these impediments? Reference _____)

7079a.35

7909a

d. Have you received any formal complaints from the private sector regarding this project?

__X__ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, how have the complaints been addressed? Reference _____

If proper references to the above questions are not constrained in the SRTP, please elaborate under a separate heading as part of "12. PLANNING JUSTIFICATION" below.

12. ADDITIONAL PLANNING JUSTIFICATION:

Routine replacement or reconditioning of CCCTA's revenue fleet is essential to the efficient, safe, and reliable provision of local mass transit services. The 14 Flyer buses being reconditioned were purchased in 1981 by AC Transit and put into service, by CCCTA, in 1983. By fiscal year 1992-93, they will have been in service 12 years. Normally a bus reaches the end of its useful life after 12 years. However, this particular reconditioning program will allow the 14 Flyers to continue providing efficient and reliable service for an additional six years. In this particular instance, bus reconditioning is preferable to bus replacement.

By extending the life of the 14 Flyers by six years, the cost to CCCTA will be $11,803 per bus/per year compared to $17,422 per bus/per year for a bus replacement project. Also, further savings will result from a streamlined spare power components inventory. This is because CCCTA, through reconditioning the Flyers, will have the same engines on all its buses. This will allow CCCTA or the Region to benefit by applying the savings to other worthy programs. To fund Phase I of this project in fiscal year 1991, CCCTA proposed to use $448,000 of unspent balances from $462,506 in prior UMTA grants to CCCTA and return the balance of $14,506 to the Region.

Phase I involves replacing existing engines in the 14 Flyers with state-of-the-art electronic engines. This involves installing component replacement engines and the conversion of the existing transmissions to match the new engines.

Phase II involves restoring the interiors with new seats and floor coverings as well as repainting each coach and replacing the air conditioning systems. Phase II is to take place in fiscal year 1991.

There is another value in reconditioning the 14 Flyers in that they are the real workhorses of the CCCTA fleet. These older heavy duty buses are better built and able to sustain heavy passenger loads. The frames, suspension, and body construction of these coaches are of such quality that CCCTA is reluctant to dispose of this asset. By replacing the power systems, air conditioning systems, and repainting the interiors and replacing the seats of these coaches, CCCTA will be able to continue operating these well-built, safe, and reliable buses.

Without reconditioning the 14 Flyers, CCCTA will not have enough revenue vehicles to meet its level of service demand. With timely reconditioning of the 14 buses, CCCTA can continue to operate efficient, safe, and reliable bus service that is not subject to disruption and patron inconvenience because of breakdowns and roadcalls.

IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE AND EXPENDITURE PLAN

Date: January 30, 1990
Project: Recondition 14 Buses (Phase II)
Operator: CCCTA
Initial Clearances Required: EIR (R), O&S Committee Approval, Board Approval

IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE:	FY 91 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 92 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 93 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 94 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4
TASK 1: Develop Specs	---O			
TASK 2: Procure/Award Bid	------O			
TASK 3: Delivery/ Install	-----O			
TASK 4:				

O: Clearances and Approvals

EXPENDITURE PLAN (000$):	FY 91	FY 92	FY 93	FY 94
UMTA SEC. 9	350,933			
UMTA SEC. 3				
OTHER FED.				
STATE TP&D				
ARTICLE XIX				
RAIL BONDS				
PCL BONDS				
OTHER STATE				
LOCAL FUNDS	87,733			
SOURCE: STA				
OP				
TOTAL FUNDS	438,666			

SAN FRANCISCO / OAKLAND URBANIZED AREA
Designated Recipient: METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Grantee: GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE, HIGHWAY, AND TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT

UMTA SECTION 9 FUNDS PROGRAMMED	
FY 1990-91 Apportionment (Est.):	$64,277,064
FY 1989-90 Carryover Funds (Exp.):	370,008
TOTAL:	$64,647,072

PROGRAM OF PROJECTS
OPERATING ASSISTANCE

	UMTA Section 9 Funds	Local Match	FY 1990-91 Net Project Cost
GGBHTD *	$1,582,099	$26,553,901	$28,136,000

PROGRAM OF PROJECTS
CAPITAL PROJECTS

	UMTA Section 9 Funds	Local Match	Total FY 1990-91 Cost
GGBHTD			
Replacement Buses (39)	$7,584,755	$1,896,189	$9,480,944
Fuel Storgage Tank - San Rafael	1,439,086	359,772	1,798,858
Replacement Ferry (1)	3,401,433	850,358	4,251,791
	$12,425,274	$3,106,319	$15,531,593
TOTAL GRANTEE PROGRAM:	$14,007,373	$29,660,220	$43,667,593

* For the period July 1, 1990 to June 30, 1991.

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION WORKSHEET
For Projects Submitted For FY 1990-91
of MTC's Transit Capital Priorities

1. OPERATOR: GGBHTD

2. PROJECT NAME: Replacement Buses

3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Purchase 39 diesel buses in FY91 to replace GMC "New Look" coaches 17 to 20 years old.

4. PROJECT CLASS: New or Used Revenue Vehicles

5. SRTP PAGE REFERENCE: pp. 102-108 TIP PAGE REFERENCE:I-6-32

6. PROPOSED FEDERAL FUNDING: $7,584,755 SOURCE: UMTA Section 9

7. PROPOSED LOCAL MATCH (20%): $1,896,189 SOURCE: STA,OP

8. TOTAL PROJECT COST: $9,480,944

9. PRIOR UMTA FUNDING: $5,125,000 from CA-90-X098, $9,120,000 from CA-90-X239, $5,040,000 from CA-90-X281, $5,292,000 from CA-90-X328

10. ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT TYPE AND STATUS:

NEPA STATUS: 23 cfr 771.117c17
CEQA STATUS: 14 Cal.Admin.Code, Section 15302 class II

11. COMPLIANCE WITH PRIVATE SECTOR PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENTS
(PLEASE COMPLETE FOR ANNUAL ELEMENT PROJECTS ONLY):

a. Was the private sector involved in the development on this project as set forth in your adopted policy?

_____ No. _X_ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _pp. 31-33_

b. Were proposals received from the private sector to operate, construct, or otherwise provide all or part of the above named project?

_X_ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, how were those proposals evaluated? Reference _____)

c. Are there impediments affecting your ability to contract for the above named project?

_X_ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, have you taken measures to address the impact of these impediments? Reference _____)

7694a/4

d. Have you received any formal complaints from the private sector regarding this project?

____ No. __X__ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, how have the complaints been addressed? Reference _ Various correspondence available on request)

12. ADDITIONAL PLANNING JUSTIFICATION:

This project is included in the FY 90 - FY 94 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) - Transit Element. Originally programmed for FY 90, a lower than anticipated UMTA Section 9 apportionment to the region resulted in the deferral of this 23 bus purchase to FY 91. In addition to these 23 buses, 16 buses have been moved forward from the FY 92 program year into the FY 91 annual element. Thus a total of 39 buses are included in this bus replacement project for FY 91.

Seven years ago, the District established a policy of replacing 25 of its 242 GMC new look buses per year with 30 new buses to gradually retire the popular buses before they become too expensive to maintain at the high standard required for the long distance Golden Gate Transit intercounty operation. The additional 5 buses per year were needed to offset a loss of seats as the 49 seat new look buses were being replaced with wheelchair lift equipped buses with only 41 seats. A total of 289 new buses were programmed to replace the 242 new look buses.

Between 1983 and 1987, in response to declining patronage, the District retired more buses than it purchased, resulting in a reduction in its fleet size from 275 to 239 bues. However in 1989, to accommodate an upturn in the patronage of existing transbay commute bus services, the District began reinstating services and thus over the next several years more buses will be purchased than retired. Of the original 242 new look buses, 147 remained in the GGT fleet at the end of 1989.

During FY 90, 80 new TMC-RTS buses were delivered and put into existing GGT service replacing as many as 45 GMC new look buses and could also replace 21 MCI buses that may be assigned to the District's Club Bus service. The new wheelchair lift equipped RTS buses have 39 seats. The current replacement schedule calls for the purchase of about 65 new buses in FY 91 using UMTA Section 9 grants for FY 89 and FY 90. They will replace as many as 52 new look buses.

The District prpposes to use FY 91 funds to purchase 39 inter-city buses with wheelchair lifts. Upon receiving these buses, sometime in FY 92, about 29 GMC new look buses with no wheelchair lift, averaging between 17 and 20 years old and between 500,000 and 700,000 miles, would be sold.

Without the replacement of the existing aging fleet, the bus service will degradate as coaches require frequent repair and become increasingly unavailable for revenue service, and become less reliable and subject to increased probability of road failure. New buses should require less costly maintenance and should be more efficient to operate than the existing buses.

Bus replacement is also the key element of the District's plans to provide transit services which are accessable to disabled persons in accordance with UMTA Section 504. It is the District's goal to provide a 100% accessable bus fleet by the end of FY 94.

Current federal EPA regulations require all buses manufactured after January 1, 1991 to meet a stringent particulate emissions standard which can not be met with diesel engine technology. Therefore the District requests additional funds be allocated (about $20,000 per bus in 1990 dollars) for purchasing buses which may be equipped with methanol engines which can meet EPA standards.

IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE AND EXPENDITURE PLAN

Date: January 30, 1990

Project: Replacement Buses
Operator: GGBHTD

Initial Clearances Required: None

IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE:	FY 91 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 92 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 93 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4
TASK 1: Grant Approval	O			
TASK 2: Bid Specs	*			
TASK 3: Bid & Award	*			
TASK 4: Delivery		* * * *		

O: Clearances and Approvals

EXPENDITURE PLAN (000$):	FY 91	FY 92	FY 93	FY
UMTA SEC. 9		$7,584,755		
UMTA SEC. 3				
OTHER FED.				
STATE TP&D				
ARTICLE XIX				
RAIL BONDS				
PCL BONDS				
OTHER STATE				
LOCAL FUNDS		$1,896,189		
SOURCE: STA				
OP				
TOTAL FUNDS		$9,480,944		

NOTE: Add $819,000 to total for methanol buses.

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION WORKSHEET
For Projects Submitted For FY 1990/91
of MTC's Transit Capital Priorities

1. OPERATOR: GGBHTD

2. PROJECT NAME: San Rafael Bus Facility Rehabilitation

3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Remove and replace underground fuel storage tanks and fuel lines to the fuel island at the central GGT bus facility in San Rafael.

4. PROJECT CLASS: Vehicle Maintenance Shops and Garage, Operating Yards and Station

5. SRTP PAGE REFERENCE: pp.109,110 TIP PAGE REFERENCE: I-6-32

6. PROPOSED FEDERAL FUNDING: $1,439,086 SOURCE: UMTA Section 9

7. PROPOSED LOCAL MATCH (20%): $359,772 SOURCE: STA,OP

8. TOTAL PROJECT COST: $1,798,858

9. PRIOR UMTA FUNDING: $2,716,000 from CA-03-0255, $2,563,000 from CA-90-X040, $233,000 from CA-90-X098, $1,700,000 from CA-90-X179

10. ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT TYPE AND STATUS: (NR)

NEPA STATUS: 23 cfr 771.115(b)
CEQA STATUS: 14 Cal.Admin.Code, Section 15302 class II

11. COMPLIANCE WITH PRIVATE SECTOR PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENTS (PLEASE COMPLETE FOR ANNUAL ELEMENT PROJECTS ONLY):

a. Was the private sector involved in the development on this project as set forth in your adopted policy?

_____ No. __X__ Yes: SRTP Page Reference pp.31-33

b. Were proposals received from the private sector to operate, construct, or otherwise provide all or part of the above named project?

__X__ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, how were those proposals evaluated? Reference _____)

c. Are there impediments affecting your ability to contract for the above named project?

7694a/22

__X__ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, have you taken measures to address the impact of these impediments? Reference _____)

d. Have you received any formal complaints from the private sector regarding this project?

__X__ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, how have the complaints been addressed? Reference _____)

12. ADDITIONAL PLANNING JUSTIFICATION:

There are currently two 25,000 gallon diesel and one 12,000 gallon methanol fuel storage tanks at the District's central bus facility in San Rafael. The diesel tanks were installed when the facility was constructed in 1972. The District must replace the tanks in accordance with Title 23 of the California Administrative Code, Chapter 3, Water Control Board, subchapter 16 - underground tank replacement. The District has recently completed preliminary engineering studies which identify construction of a below ground vaulted fuel tank system as the most desirable means of replacement. This project would include removing the existing fuel tanks, and constructing four 12,000 gallon tanks (for both diesel and methanol fuels), containment and monitoring systems, and new fuel pumps and lines on vacant land owned by the District adjacent to the existing bus facility. This is a high priority project that may be initiated with District funds and constructed in phases if necessary.

IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE AND EXPENDITURE PLAN
Date: January 30, 1990
Project: San Rafael Bus Facility Rehabilitation
Operator: GGBHTD Initial Clearances Required: Neg.Dec.

IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE:	FY 91 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 92 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 93 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 94 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4
TASK 1:Board Approval	O			
TASK 2:Design	* *			
TASK 3:Grant Approval	O			
TASK 4: Neg.Dec.	* O			
TASK 5: Permits	O			
TASK 6:Bid Specs	*			
TASK 7:Bid & Award	* *			
TASK 8: Construct		* * *		

O: Clearances and Approvals

EXPENDITURE PLAN (000$):	FY 91	FY 92	FY 93	FY 94
UMTA SEC. 9		$1,439,086		
UMTA SEC. 3				
OTHER FED.				
STATE TP&D				
ARTICLE XIX				
RAIL BONDS				
PCL BONDS				
OTHER STATE				
LOCAL FUNDS		$359,772		
SOURCE: STA				
OP				
TOTAL FUNDS		$1,798,858		

NOTE:

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION WORKSHEET
For Projects Submitted For FY 1990-91
of MTC's Transit Capital Priorities

1. OPERATOR: GGBHTD

2. PROJECT NAME: Replacement Ferry

3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Purchase a new ferry vessel in FY92 and use the 25 year old MV Golden Gate ferry vessel as a spare.

4. PROJECT CLASS: New or used revenue vehicle

5. SRTP PAGE REFERENCE: p.101 TIP PAGE REFERENCE: I-6-32

6. PROPOSED FEDERAL FUNDING: $3,401,433 SOURCE: UMTA Section 9

7. PROPOSED LOCAL MATCH (20%): $850,358 SOURCE: TP&D,STA,OP

8. TOTAL PROJECT COST: $4,251,791

9. PRIOR UMTA FUNDING: None

10. ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT TYPE AND STATUS:

NEPA STATUS: 23 cfr 771.115(b) #23
CEQA STATUS: 14 Cal.Admin.Code, Section 15301 class I

11. COMPLIANCE WITH PRIVATE SECTOR PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENTS (PLEASE COMPLETE FOR ANNUAL ELEMENT PROJECTS ONLY):

a. Was the private sector involved in the development on this project as set forth in your adopted policy?

_____ No. __X__ Yes: SRTP Page Reference pp.31-33

b. Were proposals received from the private sector to operate, construct, or otherwise provide all or part of the above named project?

__X__ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, how were those proposals evaluated? Reference _____)

c. Are there impediments affecting your ability to contract for the above named project?

__X__ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, have you taken measures to address the impact of these impediments? Reference _____)

d. Have you received any formal complaints from the private sector regarding this project?

__X__ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, how have the complaints been addressed? Reference _____)

12. ADDITIONAL PLANNING JUSTIFICATION:

This project was included in the FY90 - FY94 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) - Transit Element. In the FY 91 program year, a replacement vessel will be purchased for the ferry service between Sausalito and San Francisco which is currently operated using a single vessel: the MV Golden Gate. Upon receiving the new vessel, the MV Golden Gate will be removed from regular revenue service but will continue to operate revenue service periodically as a spare vessel. In FY 94, a replacement vessel would be purchased for the MV Golden Gate. Upon receiving this new vessel, the MV Golden Gate would be retired from service.

The MV Golden Gate was built in 1967 and put into service by the District in 1969. While the engines (replaced in FY 90) and other mechanical components of the vessel are serviceable, the hull and decks are badly deteriorated. The vessel would be about 29 years old at retirement. The standard replacement age for a ferry vessel is 25 years. If the MV Golden Gate is not replaced, service would eventually be halted due to the vessel's unseaworthiness. Also, no spare vessel would be available for weekday peak period operations when all four vessels are in service on the Sausalito and Larkspur ferry routes. In FY 89, 38 scheduled ferry trips were cancelled due to the inavailability of a spare vessel. Although this amounted to less than one percent of service, the impact upon ferry patronage is significant since service headways are 30 minutes or greater, and the average weekday peak period ferry trip carries several hundred people. Additional benefits from replacing the MV Golden Gate are: lower maintenance costs, lower operating costs, faster operating speed resulting in reduced crossing time and potential to increase patronage, higher capacity, and improved mechanical reliability of a new vessel. Also, a systemwide transportation service enhancement is possible through the interchangeability of vessels between routes and the availability of a spare vessel for meeting special needs such as at times when bus and bridge services are unavailable.

7789a.49

IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE AND EXPENDITURE PLAN
Date:January 30, 1990

Project: Replacement Ferry
Operator: GGBHTD

Initial Clearances Required: None

IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE:	FY 90 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 91 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 92 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 93 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4
TASK 1: Grant Approval		O		
TASK 2: Bid Specs		*		
TASK 3: Bid & Award		*		
TASK 4: Delivery			* * * *	

O: Clearances and Approvals

EXPENDITURE PLAN (000$):	FY 90	FY 91	FY 92	FY 93
UMTA SEC. 9			$3,401,433	
UMTA SEC. 3				
OTHER FED.				
STATE TP&D			$425,386	
ARTICLE XIX				
RAIL BONDS				
PCL BONDS				
OTHER STATE				
LOCAL FUNDS SOURCE: STA OP			$425,386	
TOTAL FUNDS			$4,251,791	

7789a.50

SAN FRANCISCO / OAKLAND URBANIZED AREA
Designated Recipient: METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Grantee: LIVERMORE AMADOR VALLEY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

UMTA SECTION 9 FUNDS PROGRAMMED	
FY 1990-91 Apportionment (Est.):	$64,277,064
FY 1989-90 Carryover Funds (Exp.):	370,008
TOTAL:	$64,647,072

PROGRAM OF PROJECTS
OPERATING ASSISTANCE

	UMTA Section 9 Funds	Local Match	FY 1990-91 Net Project Cost
LAVTA *	$0	$3,441,249	$3,441,249

PROGRAM OF PROJECTS
CAPITAL PROJECTS

	UMTA Section 9 Funds	Local Match	Total FY 1990-91 Cost
LAVTA			
No Capital Projects	$0		
	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL GRANTEE PROGRAM:	$0	$3,441,249	$3,441,249

* For the period July 1, 1990 to June 30, 1991.

SAN FRANCISCO / OAKLAND URBANIZED AREA
Designated Recipient: METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Grantee: SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL RAILWAY

UMTA SECTION 9 FUNDS PROGRAMMED	
FY 1990-91 Apportionment (Est.):	$64,277,064
FY 1989-90 Carryover Funds (Exp.):	370,008
TOTAL:	$64,647,072

PROGRAM OF PROJECTS
OPERATING ASSISTANCE

	UMTA Section 9 Funds	Local Match	FY 1990-91 Net Project Cost
S.F. MUNI *	$0	$176,873,000	$176,873,000

PROGRAM OF PROJECTS
CAPITAL PROJECTS

S.F. MUNI	UMTA Section 9 Funds	Local Match	Total FY 1990-91 Cost
Fixed Facility Rehab/Improvement	$6,674,080	$1,668,520	$8,342,600
Misc. Maint. & Repair Equipment	1,144,500	286,125	1,430,625
Non-Revenue Vehicles	729,304	182,326	911,630
DataProcessing & Office Equipment	875,164	218,791	1,093,955
Rehab 10 PCC Streetcars	2,632,632	658,158	3,290,790
Trolley OVHD Reconstruct-Rt #14	3,035,096	758,774	3,793,870
Replace 24th & Utah Shops	449,496	112,374	561,870
	$15,540,272	$3,885,068	$19,425,340
TOTAL GRANTEE PROGRAM:	$15,540,272	$180,758,068	$196,298,340

* For the period July 1, 1990 to June 30, 1991.

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION WORKSHEET

FOR PROJECTS SUBMITTED FOR THE ANNUAL ELEMENT OF MTC'S TRANSIT CAPITAL PRIORITIES

1. OPERATOR: San Francisco Municipal Railway

2. PROJECT NAME: Storage Maintenance and Other Fixed Facilities Rehabilitation

3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Structural, ventilation and other improvements to Muni's existing operating storage, maintenance and administration and other fixed facilities.

4. PROJECT CLASS: (9) Vehicle Maintenance Shops and Garages; (16) Other Fixed Assets

5. SRTP PAGE REFERENCE: C.I.P. pp. 46-48 TIP PAGE REFERENCE: I-6-40

6. PROPOSED FEDERAL FUNDING: 6,674,080 (80%) UMTA Section 9

7. PROPOSED STATE FUNDING: None

8. PROPOSED LOCAL MATCH: 1,668,520 (20%) SFMRIC/SALES TAX

9. TOTAL PROJECT COST: $8,342,600

10. PRIOR FUNDING: This is an ongoing UMTA Section 9 supported activity. Other funds used to support this activity are UMTA - FAU resources, Bridge Tolls, SFMRIC and local General Funds.

11. ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT TYPE AND STATUS: NEPA STATUS: Categorical Exclusion pursuant to 23 CFR 771.117(c)(18,19) & (d)(9). CEQA STATUS: Categorical Exemption pursuant to the State EIR Guidelines 15301(a).

12. COMPLIANCE WITH PRIVATE SECTOR PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENTS (CIRCULAR 7005.1):
Please complete for Annual Element Projects only:

    a. Was the private sector involved in the development of this project as set forth in your adopted policy?

    _____ No. __X__ Yes: SRTP Page Reference Chapter 8, pp 70-75

    b. Were proposals received from the private sector to operate, construct, or otherwise provide all or part of the above named project?

    __X__ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____

    c. Are there impediments affecting your ability to contract for the above named proect?

    __X__ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____

d. Have you received any formal complaints from the private sector regarding this project?

___X___ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____

If "Yes," how have these been addressed?

Reference _____

13. ADDITIONAL PLANNING JUSTIFICATION:

Most of Muni's operating facilities are over forty years old and much needed rehabilitation is overdue. The City and County of San Francisco recently completed a study that indicated a serious problem with deferred maintenance in city buildings and other fixed assets. It recommended a significant increase in infrastructure investment to avoid the need for total replacements later. The following types of improvements are essential to provide a safer, healthier, and more efficient operating environment.

o Physical Plant Improvements

These improvements include the following: hydraulic lift replacement; building renovation to create additional space for other activities; boiler, sprinkler, flooring, and fence replacement; drainage improvements; rehabilitation of electrical and battery charging systems; and rehabilitation of domestic water supply systems.

In FY91, the Physical Plant Improvements will focus on future facility requirements. Space Planning and functional analyses of Presidio Trolley Divison and Office Building will support the proposed redevelopment work. Similarly seismic and structural analyses of 1401 Byrant Street will determine the type of reconstruction appropriate to the building housing the Overhead Lines Shops.

Security at Muni storage facilities has been an ongoing concern. In FY91, several security improvements are proposed -- increased lighting, additional closed circuit television at the yard entrances to monitor yard access -- improved yard communications would compliment the other the security systems. Broken pavement and sidewalks present hazards to employees and equipment, FY91 funds are requested for yard and sidewalks repaving.

In FY92 electrical service improvements will be undertaken at various locations throughout the system. Additional security improvements will likely be necessary. With secure facilities, improvements to car cleaning equipment can also be considered which is an ongoing concern.

o Industrial Safety Improvements

These improvements include the following: asbestos removal; emergency lighting modifications; fire systems; fuel and waste oil piping and storage system rehabilitation; characterization and remediation of toxic contaminates from Muni facilities; hazardous waste removal; and installment of hazardous fluid control meters.

In FY91, the Industrial Safety Improvements will focus on hazardous waste identification and removal throughout the Municipal Railway's fixed facilities. Planned safety improvements to the BART/Muni Metro Subway will continue as a FY91 activity. The safety improvements include the introduction of wet stand pipes for fire protection and replacing access doors.

In FY92, additional work will likely be necessary for environmental improvements. Most of Muni's facilities are located on former industrial facilities, additional hazardous waste identification and removal will be an ongoing activity for the forseeable future Collection, handling, and detection systems for hazardous substances will be proposed for FY92 throughout the Muni system.

o Trolley Overhead System Rehabilitation

The Muni trolley overhead system supplies power to the electrically operated streetcar and trolley coach fleet. The trolley overhead system carries some 460,000 riders daily, roughly one-quarter of the region's total ridership. While much of the system has been rebuilt in the past decade, other areas of critical need still exist. The trolley special work (switches, turnouts and cross-overs) have a useful life that is less than half that of support poles and contact wire (30 years).

In FY91, reworking of the some elements of the Trolley Overhead System within the Green Center Yards would be desirable for storage of PCC streetcars and new LRVs. This project supports the reintroduction of historic streetcars into revenue service for the F-MARKET-EMBARCARERO Streetcar lines and expansion of Muni's light-rail fleet.

Future additions to the revenue fleet cannot be accommodated at the Green Center without modifications to track, switches, and overhead poles. The proposed F-MARKET streetcar line will require at least 20 historic cars. An existing antique fleet of 15 streetcars must also be maintained.

In FY91 and again in FY92, funds will also be budgeted to provide for the purchase and installation of worn special work on a periodic basis.

o Metro System Improvements

The Muni Metro System is now carrying some 135,000 riders daily. In order to maximize its potential, a number of improvements are proposed to be accomplished on an annual basis. They include: modifications and/or additions to passenger boarding platforms; rerailing work, the addition and/or modification of switches.

In FY91, additional funds are budgeted for J-M Layover Terminals to allow for greater passenger and service capacity -- high-level accessible center platforms to ease crowding and speed boarding, increased LRV storage capacity at the J terminal (four LRVs) and at the M terminal (five LRVs), four self-service fare machines to speed boarding at these busy stops, and electrically-operated track switches to improve running time and through-put.

In FY92, funds will be budgeted for the design of worn track special work. Access improvements to the Forest Hill Station platform will be proposed. The other area of emphasis will be replacement of fixed equipment within the Green Metro Center equipment which is now reaching the end of its useful life. For example, the sand dispenser within the Metro Center no longer operates reliably and should be replaced. Each LRV has four sand hoppers adjacent to its front and rear trucks which dispense sand for better traction, particularly in wet weather. The pressure feed sand dispenser in Metro Center often expels dust and clogs other equipment in the area.

The project will enhance Metro System productivity by replacing the leaky sand dispensing equipment which often interfers with the operation of fare collection equipment.

o Heating and Ventilation Improvements

As indicated previously many of Muni's facilities are quite old. As a consequence the heating and ventilation system at various facilites are inadequate and require extensive rehabilitation.

No Heating and Ventilation Improvements are proposed for FY91.

In FY92, funds will be budgeted to design, remove, and replace the boiler system at Kirkland. Funds will be requested to improve the air quality within the Muni Metro Subway Station booths as well as other heating and ventilation systems throughout the system.

o Cable Car Enhancements

With the reopening of the Cable Car System, it has become apparent that several areas of program enhancement are needed to accomplish a broad range of service related industrial plant improvements. The improvements are designed to increase productivity, lower future maintenance costs and reduce equipment downtime. Improvements have been recommended by consulting engineers. These recommendations support a preventive maintenance approach to Cable Car upkeep. The improvements are: utility work within the Cable Barn; track work; maintenance equipment; circulation improvements; and minor traction modification.

In FY91, funds will be budgeted to provide for the construction of track channel work. The design and engineering for this track work was funded with prior Section 9 funds. Additional funds will be budgeted to provide design resources to study solutions for to reduce transit noise from the Cable Car track and pulley system.

In FY92, funds will be budgeted to provide to continue the construction of track channel work. Additional funds will be budgeted to provide construction funds for Cable Car transit noise reduction.

1990-91 FIXED FACILITIES REHABILITATION FINANCIAL PLAN

Physical Plant Improvements	
o Presidio Space Planning	$100,000
o 1401 Bryant Seismic Study	$100,000
o Sidewalk and Yard Repaving	$250,000
o Yard Security and Communications	$500,000
Physical Plant Subtotal	$950,000
Industrial Safety Improvements	
o System-wide Waste Collection/Identification/Removal	$1,000,000
o BART/Muni Metro Subway Safety Improvements	2,000,000
Industrial Safety Subtotal	$3,000,000
Trolley System Improvements	
o Green Center Yard Trolley System Rehabilitation	$400,000
o Purchase and Installation of Worn Special Work	200,000
Trolley System Subtotal	$600,000
Metro System Improvements	
o J-M Layover Terminals	$2,892,600
Metro System Subtotal	$2,892,600
Cable Car Enhancements	
o Track Channel Construction	$750,000
o Cable Car Noise Study	$150,000
Cable Car Subtotal	$900,000
TOTAL	$8,342,600

The 1990-97 areas of emphasis and budgeted amounts are listed below:

FIXED FACILITY IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE

	TASKS	BEGIN	COMPLETE
o	Environmental Analysis	October, 1986	January, 1987
o	Facility Needs Assessment	December, 1988	August, 1989
o	Scope Development	December, 1988	December, 1991
o	Design and Engineering/1/	March, 1991	March, 1992
o	Construction	March, 1992	July, 1993

/1/ Assumes capital funding available.

FIXED FACILITIES REHABILITATION FINANCIAL PLAN
(thousands in escalated dollars)

	1990-91	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	1994-95	1995-97
Physical Plant Improvements	950,000	$2,000,000	-0-	$2,700,000	1,600,000	3,200,000
Industrial Safety Improvements	3,000,000	600,000	-0-	1,000,000	2,000,000	4,000,000
Trolley System Improvements	600,000	250,000	-0-	250,000	250,000	500,000
Metro System Improvements	2,892,600	1,000,000	-0-	750,000	1,000,000	2,000,000
Heating/Ventilation Improvements	-0-	530,600	-0-	600,000	600,000	1,200,000
Cable Car Enhancements	900,000	1,000,000	-0-	632,100	981,410	1,835,980
TOTAL	$8,342,600	$5,380,600	-0-	$5,932,100	$6,381,410	$13,735,980
SEVEN YEAR TOTAL	$39,722,694					

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION WORKSHEET

FOR PROJECTS SUBMITTED FOR THE ANNUAL ELEMENT OF MTC'S TRANSIT CAPITAL PRIORITIES

1. OPERATOR: San Francisco Municipal Railway

2. PROJECT NAME: Miscellaneous Equipment and Non-Revenue Vehicles

3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Equipment needed on an ongoing basis for continued operation of Muni's transportation, maintenance, and administrative functions.

4. PROJECT CLASS: (3) Service Vehicles; (13) Data Processing; (14) Communications; (15) Office Equipment.

5. SRTP PAGE REFERENCE: C.I.P. pp. 49-50, 69-72 TIP PAGE REFERENCE:I-6-40

6. PROPOSED FEDERAL FUNDING: $2,748,968 (80%) UMTA Section 9

7. PROPOSED STATE FUNDING: None

8. PROPOSED LOCAL MATCH: $687,242 (20%) BRIDGE TOLL/SFMRIC

9. TOTAL PROJECT COST: $3,436,210

10. PRIOR FUNDING: This is an ongoing UMTA Section 9 supported activity. Other funds used to support this activity are Bridge Tolls, SFMRIC and local General Funds.

11. ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT TYPE AND STATUS: NEPA STATUS: Categorical Exclusion pursuant to 23 CFR 771.117 (c)(19). CEQA STATUS: Categorical Exemption pursuant to the State EIR Guidelines 15302(c).

12. COMPLIANCE WITH PRIVATE SECTOR PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENTS (CIRCULAR 7005.1):
Please complete for Annual Element Projects only:

    a. Was the private sector involved in the development of this project as set forth in your adopted policy?

    _____ No. __X__ Yes: SRTP Page Reference Chapter 8, pp. 70-75

    b. Were proposals received from the private sector to operate, construct, or otherwise provide all or part of the above named project?

    __X__ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____

c. Are there impediments affecting your ability to contract for the above named proect?

___X___ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____

d. Have you received any formal complaints from the private sector regarding this project?

___X___ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____

If "Yes," how have these been addressed?

Reference _____

13. ADDITIONAL PLANNING JUSTIFICATION:

This project includes the purchase of new equipment needed on an ongoing basis for the continued operation of Muni's transportation, maintenance, and administrative functions. This equipment is requested by Muni and PUC support departments as part of the annual operating budget submission each winter. The items include: non-revenue vehicles (sedans and trucks); shop tools and maintenance equipment; data processing; and office furnishings not provided under other special capital programs or projects. This equipment has exceeded its useful life. The FY91-97 areas of emphasis and budgeted amounts are listed below:

Service Vehicles and Sedans

In FY91, the non-revenue vehicle project will emphasize communication equipment. The communication equipment in the non-revenue fleet has exceeded its useful life. The 300 PUC and Municipal Railway trucks, vans, and sedans do not uniformly have communication equipment that operates on the same emergency channels. Replacement parts are not available for the oldest radios. The radios have not been replaced with vehicles purchases. Some PUC or Municipal Railway vehicles would be equiped with mobile telephones as well as radios. This communication equipment would support emergency preparedness needs. Additionally, the project provides for the specification preparation for future non-revenue vehicle purchases.

Data Processing and Office Equipment

In FY91, the data processing and office equipment project will emphasize personal computers to support the planning, engineering, administrative, and management needs of the Municipal Railway. The PUC and Municipal Railway administrative and professional staff do not uniformly have dedicated personal computers available. The computers, related software, and office equipment are essential to support the organizational objectives for the PUC and the Municipal Railway.

In FY91 Muni will develop and implement a Facility Maintenance Management System. This system will provide management of ongoing routine maintenance activities in a consistent and systematic fashion. The system will utilize off-the-shelf technology to support the necessary preventive maintenance functions vital to Muni's operational requirements.

The system will provide maintenance schedules; tracking staffing availability and allocation; and will include routine maintenance reporting capabilities. There will be a tie-in to the already developed Materials Management System to monitor inventory control, spare parts, and consumable stocking levels to the end of providing longitudinal equipment needs. Finally, the system will generate work orders and initiate management feedback.

In the future, expansion of the Passenger Information System would be desirable. As presently conceived, the system would provide real-time transit schedule information from the Automated Vehicle Locator System (AVL) to Muni passengers. The public information would be available from Muni telephone information operators.

Maintenance and Repair Equipment

In FY91, the maintenance and repair equipment project will focus on the replacement of existing worn equipment. Funds would be required to purchase new maintenance equipment as well. Adequate maintenance and repair equipment is essential to ensure the transit service objectives of the Municipal Railway.

MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT AND NON-REVENUE VEHICLES IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE

	TASKS	BEGIN	COMPLETE
o	Environmental Analysis	October, 1986	January, 1987
o	Scope Preparation	December, 1989	April, 1990
o	Specification Preparation/1/	May, 1990	September, 1990
o	Equipment Purchase	December, 1991	December, 1992

/1/ Assumes capital funding available.

MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT AND NON-REVENUE VEHICLES FINANCIAL PLAN
(allocations in budgeted amounts)

	1990-91	1991-94	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97
Service Vehicles and Sedans	$911,630	-0-	$3,490,500	$1,221,675	$1,026,200
Data Processing and Office Equipment	1,093,955	-0-	1,396,195	750,000	750,000
Maintenance and Repair Equipment	1,430,625	-0-	5,215,000	1,825,900	1,917,200
TOTAL	$3,436,210	-0-	$8,687,250	$3,797,575	$3,693,400
FIVE YEAR TOTAL:	$14,354,230				

MTC TRANSIT CAPITAL PRIORITIES SUBMITTAL FY90-FY97

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION WORKSHEET

FOR PROJECTS SUBMITTED FOR THE ANNUAL ELEMENT OF MTC'S TRANSIT CAPITAL PRIORITIES

1. OPERATOR: San Francisco Municipal Railway

2. PROJECT NAME: F-MARKET Streetcar Line, PCC Rehabilitation

3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION: This project will rehabilitation PCC streetcars for use on the F-MARKET-EMBARCADERO Streetcar Line. The elements already funded include a PCC streetcar specification as well as the actual rehabilitation of ten PCC streetcars. Ten PCC streetcars are proposed for rehabilitation in FY91 with UMTA Section 9 and State TCI funding. Six more PCC streetcars are expected to be necessary and are therefore proposed for rehabilitation in FY95 with UMTA Section 9 and State TCI funding.

4. PROJECT CLASS: (1) New or Used Revenue Vehicles

5. SRTP PAGE REFERENCE: C.I.P. pp. 43-48 TIP PAGE REFERENCE: I-6-41

6. PROPOSED FEDERAL FUNDING: $2,632,632 (80%) UMTA Section 9

7. PROPOSED STATE FUNDING: $329,079 (10%) Article XIX/TP&D

8. PROPOSED LOCAL FUNDING: $329,079 (10%) TIDF

9. TOTAL PROJECT COST: $3,290,790

10. PRIOR FUNDING: UMTA Section 3 and 9 and State Guideway funds were used for planning, engineering and actual rebuilding of 10 Streetcars.

11. ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT TYPE AND STATUS: NEPA: A Finding of No Significant Impact on the Environment was made in 1988 after completion of an Environmental Assessment for twelve of the twenty streetcars. A Finding of No Significant Impact on the Environment is expected in 1990 on the remaining streetcars as part of F-EMBARCADERO Environmental Assessment. CEQA: Categorical Exemption for Phase C pursuant to State EIR Guidelines 15301(b,c) 1985.

12. COMPLIANCE WITH PRIVATE SECTOR PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENTS (CIRCULAR 7005.1):

Please complete for Annual Element Projects only:

a. Was the private sector involved in the development of this project as set forth in your adopted policy?

_____ No. __X__ Yes: SRTP Page Reference Chapter 8, pp. 70-75

b. Were proposals received from the private sector to operate, construct, or otherwise provide all or part of the above named project?

__X__ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____

6151G/1/30/90

c. Are there impediments affecting your ability to contract for the above named project?

__X__ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____

d. Have you received any formal complaints from the private sector regarding this project?

__X__ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____

If "Yes," how have these been addressed?

Reference _____

13. ADDITIONAL PLANNING JUSTIFICATION:

The planning and service justification for the project are included in the discussion for the associated capital project, Market Street Transit Thoroughfare. Service plans for the F-MARKET-EMBARCADERO indicates that 26 PCCs necessary would be necessary to meet service demands therefore six additional PCCs are proposed for rehabilitation in FY95 with UMTA Section 9 and State TCI funding. The overall vehicle schedule and budget are as follows:

F-MARKET STREETCAR LINE, PCC REHABILITATION IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE

STREETCAR REHABILITATION TASKS	BEGIN WORK	COMPLETE WORK
Environmental Analysis	September, 1986	December, 1986
Conceptual Engineering	September, 1988	November, 1988
Specification Preparation	November, 1989	October, 1990
Bid Call and Contract Award	November, 1990	February, 1991
Rebuild 10 PCCs	April, 1991	March, 1992
Bid Call and Contract Award	July, 1991	September, 1991
Rebuild 10 PCCs /1/	October, 1991	September, 1992

/1/ Assumes capital fund availability and that the Environmental Assessment for the F-EMBARCADERO Streetcar Extension is complete.

6151G/1/30/90

The overall project financial plan is as follows:

F-MARKET STREETCAR LINE, PCC REHABILITATION FINANCIAL PLAN

	Prior Year	1990-91	1994-95	TOTAL
Rehabilitation of 26 PCCs	$3,116,590	$3,290,790	$2,896,000	$9,303,380
TOTAL	$3,116,590	$3,290,790	$2,896,000	$9,303,380

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION WORKSHEET

FOR PROJECTS SUBMITTED FOR THE ANNUAL ELEMENT OF MTC'S TRANSIT CAPITAL PRIORITIES

1. OPERATOR: San Francisco Municipal Railway

2. PROJECT NAME: Trolley Overhead Reconstruction: 14-MISSION Line

3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The project proposed for 1990-91 Annual Element provides for the phased design and reconstruction of the trolley overhead system serving the Municipal Railway's 14-MISSION trolley route.

4. PROJECT CLASS: (5) Power Generation and Distribution Facilities

5. SRTP PAGE REFERENCE: C.I.P pp. 49-50 TIP PAGE REFERENCE: I-6-41

6. PROPOSED FEDERAL FUNDING: $3,035,096 (80%) UMTA Section 9

7. PROPOSED STATE FUNDING: $398,357 (10%) TP&D/ARTICLE XIX

8. PROPOSED LOCAL FUNDING: $398,357 (10%) HETCH HETCHY

9. TOTAL PROJECT COST: $3,793,870

10. PRIOR FUNDING: The reconstruction of the trolley overhead system has been an ongoing capital program since 1978. UMTA, the California Transportation Commssion and the Hetch Hetchy Power Project have provided ongoing capital assistance for this activity.

11. ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT TYPE AND STATUS: NEPA STATUS: Categorical Exclusion pursuant to 23 CFR 771.117(c)(18). CEQA STATUS: Negative Declaration finalized 1978.

12. COMPLIANCE WITH PRIVATE SECTOR PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENTS (CIRCULAR 7005.1):

    Please complete for Annual Element Projects only:

    a. Was the private sector involved in the development of this project as set forth in your adopted policy?

       _____ No. __X__ Yes: SRTP Page Reference Chapter 8, pp. 70-75

    b. Were proposals received from the private sector to operate, construct, or otherwise provide all or part of the above named project?

       __X__ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____

    c. Are there impediments affecting your ability to contract for the above named proect?

       __X__ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____

d. Have you received any formal complaints from the private sector regarding this project?

__X__ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____

If "Yes," how have these been addressed?

Reference _____

13. ADDITIONAL PLANNING JUSTIFICATION:

In 1978 the Municipal Railway began a multi-year effort to rehabilitate its extensive trolley coach overhead network, most of which was originally constructed in the 1940's and 1950's. The project objective is to maintain Muni's physical plant and to avoid continuing operational problems, reduce maintenance costs, and increase system reliability.

The reconstruction work consists of the replacement of all of the worn out components such as all of the intersection special work (switches, crossings, curve segments, etc.), trolley wire, and certain of the trolley poles and tangent spans which have deteriorated beyond repair. Street light, traffic signal and trolley overhead facilities will be consolidated on single poles where feasible and where such consolidation will result in the removal of excess poles. This mitigation measure has been incorporated into the project program. The measure responds to the City's Comprehensive Master Plan Policy which calls for the removal of redundant street furniture in order to improve pedestrian ciculation. The new construction and reconstruction work will be upgraded to include features which will provide a more reliable system with regards to operations and maintenance.

The priorities for rebuilding are determined by the latest analyses of overhead maintenance requirements and road call frequencies compiled by Muni Operations and the Overhead Lines Department. The recommended priorities and schedule for the next five years are shown below. The priorities will be re-evaluated as the results of the ongoing Rail Trolley Overhead Infrastructure Study are made available.

TROLLEY OVERHEAD RECONSTRUCTION PRIORITIES AND FINANCIAL PLAN
(thousands in escalated dollars)

	Prior Year	1990-91	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97
14-MISSION Line	$5,409	$3,794	$3,984	-0-	$4,392	$2,000	-0-	-0-
4-SUTTER Line	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	1,611	-0-	-0-
6-PARNASSUS Line	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	1,000	-0-	-0-
7-HAIGHT Line	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	$4,843	$5,084
TOTAL	$5,409	$3,794	$3,984	-0-	$4,392	$4,611	$4,843	$5,084

TROLLEY OVERHEAD RECONSTRUCTION IMPLEMENTATION

	14-MISSION TASKS	BEGIN WORK	COMPLETE WORK
o	Negative Declaration	November, 1977	March, 1978
o	Overhead Survey	December, 1985	October 1986
o	Conceptual Engineering	November, 1989	January, 1990
o	Design and Engineering	January, 1990	December, 1990
o	Construction Bid/Award	December, 1990	February, 1991
o	Construction	March, 1991	February, 1995

	6-PARNASSUS/4-SUTTER TASKS	BEGIN WORK	COMPLETE WORK
o	Negative Declaration	November, 1977	March, 1978
o	Overhead Survey	December, 1987	October 1988
o	Conceptual Engineering	November, 1994	January, 1995
o	Design and Engineering	January, 1995	December, 1995
o	Construction Bid/Award	December, 1995	March, 1996
o	Construction	April, 1996	February, 1997

	7-HAIGHT TASKS	BEGIN WORK	COMPLETE WORK
o	Negative Declaration	November, 1977	March, 1978
o	Overhead Survey	December, 1987	October 1988
o	Conceptual Engineering	November, 1996	January, 1997
o	Design and Engineering	January, 1997	December, 1997
o	Construction Bid/Award	December, 1997	March, 1998
o	Construction	April, 1998	February, 1998

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION WORKSHEET

FOR PROJECTS SUBMITTED FOR THE ANNUAL ELEMENT OF MTC'S TRANSIT CAPITAL PRIORITIES

1. OPERATOR: San Francisco Municipal Railway

2. PROJECT NAME: 24th and Utah Maintenance Shop Replacement Facility

3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Provide a replacement facility to house the Ways and Structures and Special Machine Shop functions, currently located at 24th and Utah, to satisfy the Railway's long-term space requirement for necessary facilities maintenance functions. The 1990-91 phase of this project will provide funds for preliminary design work.

4. PROJECT CLASS: (9) Vehicle Maintenance Shops and Garage

5. SRTP PAGE REFERENCE: C.I.P. pp. 71-72 TIP PAGE REFERENCE: I-6-42

6. PROPOSED FEDERAL FUNDING: $449,496 (80%) UMTA Section 9

7. PROPOSED STATE FUNDING: None

8. PROPOSED LOCAL FUNDING: $112,374 (20%) SFMRIC

   TOTAL PROJECT COST: $561,870

9. PRIOR FUNDING: UMTA Section 9 funds were made available for overall planning and conceptual design.

10. ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT TYPE AND STATUS: NEPA STATUS: Categorical Exclusion pursuant to 23 CFR 771.117 (d)(8,9). CEQA STATUS: Categorical Exemption pursuant to the State EIR Guidelines 15302(c).

11. COMPLIANCE WITH PRIVATE SECTOR PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENTS (CIRCULAR 7005.1): Please complete for Annual Element Projects only:

    a. Was the private sector involved in the development of this project as set forth in your adopted policy?

       _____ No. __X__ Yes: SRTP Page Reference Chapter 8, pp. 70-75

    b. Were proposals received from the private sector to operate, construct, or otherwise provide all or part of the above named project?

       __X__ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____

    c. Are there impediments affecting your ability to contract for the above named proect?

       __X__ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____

d. Have you received any formal complaints from the private sector regarding this project?

__X__ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____

If "Yes," how have these been addressed?

Reference _____

13. ADDITIONAL PLANNING JUSTIFICATION:

The 24th and Utah Facility was originally constructed as a Union Railway Station. It was later used by the Market Street Railway for a variety of maintenance functions before serving as the first Municipal Railway diesel facility. The PUC facility situated on the block bounded by Utah, San Bruno, 23rd and 24th Streets houses three Municipal Railway departments:

- o Facilities Maintenance Ways and Structures
- o Equipment Maintenance Special Machine Shop
- o Non-Revenue Vehicle Maintenance

The 1990-91 phase project provides funds to complete design and engineering analysis so that a replacement facility can be constructed to house Municipal Railway Shops in order to meet Muni's long-term space requirement for facilities maintenance functions. Future year funds are required for construction activities.

The three departments coexist in one building which occupies approximately two-thirds of the 80,000 square foot site. The remainder of the site is devoted to vehicle parking. Because the building was constructed during the early part of the century, structural problems exist, such as cracking brick walls and insufficient structural support to prevent major earthquake damage. The building has deteriorated utility systems as well as inadequate heating and lighting systems. Preliminary analysis of the 24th and Utah Shops indicates that the building has such significant structural and utility problems that demolition and new construction is the preferable solution. Analysis of the site conditions indicates that there are toxics present, that could be derived from past Railroad or Muni use. In either case, additional engineering studies are required in order to determine the amount and type of treatment to clean the site.

The Non-Revenue Vehicle Maintenance Shop will be relocated to the ground floor of the William B. Scott Facility in 1990. The site of the 24th and Utah Shops has been identified for development as parking by the adjacent San Francisco General Hospital. The San Francisco General Hospital is updating its Institutional Master Plan and preparing environmental analysis of a proposed Hospital expansion. A land swap is being explored with the Hospital and other City departments in order to relocate the 24th and Utah Shop functions to a new site.

Assuming that the 24th and Utah uses would be relocated, the San Francisco Real Estate Department has also been looking for a new Shop location. The proposal to replace the shops on the same site has been dropped from consideration. The site is unrelated to other Municipal Railway facilities and is desired by the City for other purposes. The Municipal Railway's preferred solution is to locate the new Shops at a Muni facility. It is believed that the existing Woods site would allow such an opportunity after the Woods Annex is constructed. Once the Islais Creek site is assembled, the architectural and design program will be finalized to verify which program elements would be moved to and from the existing Woods site.

The project scope for the Replacement of the 24th and Utah Shops is unchanged. The location of the improvements would be different but the physical features and architectural program are the same. The project still provides for the relocation of the functions now housed at 24th and Utah in the Mission District. The project provides for the construction of a new Shop shop that can accommodate the needs of Ways and Structures. The project could provide funds for the remediation of the 24th and Utah site. The proximity of Muni's other facilities is such that interaction and management of functions would be better with the Shops relocated to Woods than in the current 24th and Utah location.

24TH AND UTAH MAINTENANCE SHOP REPLACEMENT IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE

	TASKS	BEGIN WORK	COMPLETE WORK
o	Planning and Conceptual Design	January, 1987	March, 1988
o	Site Condition Analysis	January, 1988	March, 1990
o	Environmental Analysis	November, 1988	June, 1989
o	Conceptual Design Activities	January, 1990	March, 1991
o	Detailed Design Activities /1/	April, 1991	June, 1992
o	Construction Activities /2/	April, 1993	January, 1996

/1/ Assumes capital fund availability and schedule coordination with the Woods Annex construction.

/2/ Assumes construction coordination with Woods Redevelopment and Annex

---

6151G/1/30/90

24TH AND UTAH MAINTENANCE SHOP REPLACEMENT FINANCIAL PLAN
(in budgeted amounts)

	Prior Year	1990-91	1994-95	1995-96	Total
Project Engineering	$250,000	$561,870	-0-	-0-	$811,870
Construction	-0-	-0-	$9,375,000	$1,527,730	$10,902,730
TOTAL	$250,000	$561,870	$9,375,000	$1,527,730	$11,714,600

SAN FRANCISCO / OAKLAND URBANIZED AREA
Designated Recipient: METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Grantee: SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT

UMTA SECTION 9 FUNDS PROGRAMMED	
FY 1990-91 Apportionment (Est.):	$64,277,064
FY 1989-90 Carryover Funds (Exp.):	370,008
TOTAL:	$64,647,072

PROGRAM OF PROJECTS
OPERATING ASSISTANCE

	UMTA Section 9 Funds	Local Match	FY 1990-91 Net Project Cost
SamTrans *	$1,475,015	$30,585,500	$32,060,515

PROGRAM OF PROJECTS
CAPITAL PROJECTS

	UMTA Section 9 Funds	Local Match	Total FY 1990-91 Cost
SamTrans			
Replacement Vans (4)	$281,280	$70,320	$351,600
Expans. Buses-(6 w/over match)	674,458	520,215	1,194,673
	$955,738	$590,535	$1,546,273
TOTAL GRANTEE PROGRAM:	$2,430,753	$31,176,035	$33,606,788

* For the period July 1, 1990 to June 30, 1991.

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION WORKSHEET
For Projects Submitted For FY 90/91
of MTC's Transit Capital Priorities

1. OPERATOR: SamTrans

2. PROJECT NAME: Replacement Paratransit Vehicles

3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Replacement of four (4) paratransit vehicles in FY 90/91.

4. PROJECT CLASS: (1) New or Used Vehicles

5. SRTP PAGE REFERENCE: III-2 TIP PAGE REFERENCE: I-6-53

6. PROPOSED FEDERAL FUNDING: $281,280 SOURCE: UMTA Section 9

7. PROPOSED LOCAL MATCH (20%): $56,256 SOURCE: STA
$14,064 SamTrans Sales Tax

8. TOTAL PROJECT COST: $351,600

9. PRIOR UMTA FUNDING: No

10. ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT TYPE AND STATUS:

NEPA STATUS: 23 cfr T11.119a
CEQA STATUS: 14Cal.Admin.Code, Section 15300(15)

11. COMPLIANCE WITH PRIVATE SECTOR PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENTS
(PLEASE COMPLETE FOR ANNUAL ELEMENT PROJECTS ONLY):

a. Was the private sector involved in the development on this project as set forth in your adopted policy?

_____ No. _X_ Yes: SRTP Page Reference P. 1-6 (Std. V.6.3.)
P. A-1 (Item 3)
P. A-3 (Item 3)

b. Were proposals received from the private sector to operate, construct, or otherwise provide all or part of the above named project?

_X_ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference P. A-1 (Item 2)
(If yes, how were those proposals evaluated? Reference _____)

c. Are there impediments affecting your ability to contract for the above named project?

_X_ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference P. A-1 (Item 4)
(If yes, have you taken measures to address the impact of these impediments? Reference _____)

d. Have you received any formal complaints from the private sector regarding this project?

_X_ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference P. A-2 (Item 6)
(If yes, how have the complaints been addressed? Reference _____

If proper references to the above questions are not constrained in the SRTP, please elaborate under a separate heading as part of "12. PLANNING JUSTIFICATION" below.

12. ADDITIONAL PLANNING JUSTIFICATION:

SamTrans is the largest provider of paratransit service in San Mateo County. Redi-Wheels currently provides 32,200 hours of service for transit disabled individuals and agency sponsored trips and will be adding 15,000 hours of service for additional agency trips effective July 1, 1990. The new service, to be provided by Redi-Wheels is currently provided by Poplar Center, a local nonprofit agency which is terminating this service due to financial losses. SamTrans has assumed this additional responsibiity for paratransit service because there is no other organization capable of doing so.

Poplar intends to keep 12 of its 17 paratransit vehicles to provide service to its own developmentally disabled clients. The five remaining vehicles in Poplar's fleet are aged and in poor condition, including three vehicles that are more than seven years old. In addition, these vehicles are gasoline-powered so cannot be maintained by SamTrans. The cost of leasing vehicles is prohibitively expensive --up to $20,000 per month for four paratransit vehicles.

In order to meet the existing level of paratransit service--with absolutely no expansion--SamTrans will need to deploy its entire fleet of 12 Redi-Wheels vehicles (now operated by Poplar Center) and acquire eight additional vehicles. SamTrans is now in the process of ordering four (4) of these eight (8) vehicles and will seek a letter of No Prejudice (LONP) from UMTA to allow us to purchase the remaining four. SamTrans will then immediately pourchase the vehicles using its own sales tax revenues in anticipation of reimbursement with UMTA Section 9 and STA funds.

7909a.21

MPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE AND EXPENDITURE PLAN
Date: November 30, 1989

Project: Replacement Paratransit Vehicles
Operator:

Initial Clearances Required:

IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE *	FY 90/91 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 91/92 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4
TASK 1: Issue Bid Document	--			
TASK 2: Award of Bid	--			
TASK 3: Vehicles in Service	--			

Assumes receipt of LONP.

O: Clearances and Approvals

EXPENDITURE PLAN	FY 90/91	FY 91/92	FY	FY
UMTA SEC. 9	$281,280			
YNTA SEC. 3				
OTHER FED.				
STATE TP&D				
ARTICLE XIX				
RAIL BONDS				
PCL BONDS				
OTHER STATE STA	$ 56,256*			
LOCAL FUNDS SOURCE: SALES TAX	$ 14,064*			
TOTAL FUNDS	$351,600			

Will use sales tax if ineligible for STA funds.

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION WORKSHEET
For Projects Submitted For FY 90/91
of MTC's Transit Capital Priorities

1. OPERATOR: SamTrans

2. PROJECT NAME: Expansion Buses

3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Six (6) standard 40' coaches to be used for expanded service.

4. PROJECT CLASS: (1) New or Used Vehicles

5. SRTP PAGE REFERENCE: III-2 TIP PAGE REFERENCE: I-6-53

6. PROPOSED FEDERAL FUNDING: $674,458 SOURCE: UMTA Section 9

7. PROPOSED LOCAL MATCH (20%): $520,215 SOURCE: SamTrans

8. TOTAL PROJECT COST: $1,194,673

9. PRIOR UMTA FUNDING: none

10. ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT TYPE AND STATUS: (NR)

NEPA STATUS: 23 cfr 771.117c17
CEQA STATUS: 14 Cal.Admin.Code, Section 15302

11. COMPLIANCE WITH PRIVATE SECTOR PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENTS (PLEASE COMPLETE FOR ANNUAL ELEMENT PROJECTS ONLY):

a. Was the private sector involved in the development on this project as set forth in your adopted policy?

_____ No. _X_ Yes: SRTP Page Reference p.A.-1,p.1-6

b. Were proposals received from the private sector to operate, construct, or otherwise provide all or part of the above named project?

_X_ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, how were those proposals evaluated? Reference _____)

c. Are there impediments affecting your ability to contract for the above named project?

_X_ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, have you taken measures to address the impact of these impediments? Reference _____)

7909a.12

d. Have you received any formal complaints from the private sector regarding this project?

_X_ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, how have the complaints been addressed? Reference _____

If proper references to the above questions are not constrained in the SRTP, please elaborate under a separate heading as part of "12. PLANNING JUSTIFICATION" below.

12. ADDITIONAL PLANNING JUSTIFICATION:

In accordance with the District's adopted FY 1989/90 - 1993-94 Five-Year Plan. there will be a need to expand the fleet by six vehicles in FY 1990/91. The peak bus and spare bus requirements will necessitate the addition of six more buses. Five of these buses will be used for expnded service and one vehicle would be used to supplement the spare bus fleet. It is planned to offer new service in the northern section of I-280 which is now limited to service south of San Bruno. Current I-280 service is limited to Route 28 which is currently at capacity and Route 3C which is near capacity. There is growing demand for an express service during commute hours and the District envisions that the proposed I-280 service would fill this need.

Project Merit

This project will enable the District to proceed with its plans for service expansions.

The six new vehicles will comply with the 1991 EPA emission standards and will meet E & H accessibility requirements.

The new buses will be assigned to proposed new service routes in the northern section of I-280.

7909a.13

MPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE AND EXPENDITURE PLAN
Date: May 30, 1990

Project: Six Expansion Buses
Operator: SamTrans

Initial Clearances Required:

IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE	FY 90/91 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 91/92 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 92/93 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4
TASK 1: Submit Grant Grant Approval	Aug Mar			
TASK 2: Advertise Bid Bid Open	Mar	Sept		
TASK 3: Award Bid Notice to Proceed		Nov Jan		
Delivery			Sept	

OTE: Preliminary may change based on final acceptance and award of bid.

O: Clearances and Approvals

EXPENDITURE PLAN	FY 90/91	FY 91/92	FY	FY
UMTA SEC. 9	$ 674,458			
YNTA SEC. 3				
OTHER FED.				
STATE TP&D				
ARTICLE XIX				
RAIL BONDS				
PCL BONDS				
OTHER STATE				
LOCAL FUNDS				
SOURCE: SamTrans	$ 520.215			
TOTAL FUNDS	$1,194,673			

NOTE: Preliminary may change based on final acceptance and award of bid.

SAN FRANCISCO / OAKLAND URBANIZED AREA
Designated Recipient: METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Grantee: CITY OF VALLEJO

UMTA SECTION 9 FUNDS PROGRAMMED	
FY 1990-91 Apportionment (Est.):	$64,277,064
FY 1989-90 Carryover Funds (Exp.):	370,008
TOTAL:	$64,647,072

PROGRAM OF PROJECTS
OPERATING ASSISTANCE

	UMTA Section 9 Funds	Local Match	FY 1990-91 Net Project Cost
Vallejo *	$192,306	$2,019,987	$2,212,293

PROGRAM OF PROJECTS
CAPITAL PROJECTS

	UMTA Section 9 Funds	Local Match	Total FY 1990-91 Cost
Vallejo			
No Capital Projects	$0		
	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL GRANTEE PROGRAM.	$192,306	$2,019,987	$2,212,293

* For the period July 1, 1990 to June 30, 1991.

-blank-

FY 1990-91 SECTION 9 PROGRAM OF PROJECTS

SAN JOSE URBANIZED AREA

SAN JOSE URBANIZED AREA
Designated Recipient: METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

UMTA SECTION 9 FUNDS PROGRAMMED	
FY 1990-91 Apportionment (Est.):	$14,682,021
FY 1989-90 Carryover Funds:	901,855
TOTAL:	$15,583,876

PROGRAM OF PROJECTS
OPERATING ASSISTANCE

	UMTA Section 9 Funds	UMTA Section 9 Cumulative Total
CalTrain	$561,031	
SCCTD	6,157,852	
	$6,718,883	
		$6,718,883

PROGRAM OF PROJECTS
CAPITAL PROJECTS

	UMTA Section 9 Funds	UMTA Section 9 Cumulative Total	Local Match	Total FY 1990-91 Cost
CalTrain				
SF Terminal Extension (SJ)	$1,187,500		$296,875	$1,484,375
Accessibility (SJ)	1,627,068		406,767	2,033,835
	$2,814,568		$703,642	$3,518,210
		$9,533,451		
SCCTD				
Replacement Buses (41)	$6,530,874		$1,632,719	$8,163,593
	$6,530,874		$1,632,719	$8,163,593
		$16,064,325		

SAN JOSE URBANIZED AREA
Designated Recipient: METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Grantee: CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (FOR CALTRAIN)

UMTA SECTION 9 FUNDS PROGRAMMED	
FY 1990-91 Apportionment (Est.):	$14,682,021
FY 1989-90 Carryover Funds:	901,855
TOTAL:	$15,583,876

PROGRAM OF PROJECTS
OPERATING ASSISTANCE

	UMTA Section 9 Funds	Local Match	FY 1990-91 Net Project Cost
CalTrain *	$561,031	$9,432,686	$9,993,717

PROGRAM OF PROJECTS
CAPITAL PROJECTS

	UMTA Section 9 Funds	Local Match	Total FY 1990-91 Cost
CalTrain			
SF Terminal Extension (SJ)	$1,187,500	$296,875	$1,484,375
Accessibility (SJ)	1,627,068	406,767	2,033,835
	$2,814,568	$703,642	$3,518,210
TOTAL GRANTEE PROGRAM:	$3,375,599	$10,136,328	$13,511,927

* For the period July 1, 1990 to June 30, 1991.

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION WORKSHEET
For Projects Submitted For FY 1990/91 & 93/94
of MTC's Transit Capital Priorities

1. OPERATOR: Caltrans

2. PROJECT NAME: San Francisco Terminal Relocation

3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The proposed project is to relocate the PCS's downtown terminal station to better serve the transit patron.

4. PROJECT CLASS: (6) Passenger Stations

5. SRTP PAGE REFERENCE: III-16 TIP PAGE REFERENCE: I-6-19

6. PROPOSED FEDERAL FUNDING: $2,500,000 ($1,312,500 SF/O UZA; $1,187,500 SJ UZA) SOURCE: UMTA Sections 3 and 9

7. PROPOSED LOCAL MATCH (75%): $7,500,000 SOURCE: State Rail Bond Funds, SMCTA and Local Operators

8. TOTAL PROJECT COST: $10,000,000

9. PRIOR UMTA FUNDING: none

10. ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT TYPE AND STATUS: (NR)

NEPA STATUS: EIS pending
CEQA STATUS: EIR pending

11. COMPLIANCE WITH PRIVATE SECTOR PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENTS
(PLEASE COMPLETE FOR ANNUAL ELEMENT PROJECTS ONLY):

a. Was the private sector involved in the development on this project as set forth in your adopted policy?

_____ No. _X_ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _Appendix_

b. Were proposals received from the private sector to operate, construct, or otherwise provide all or part of the above named project?

_x_ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, how were those proposals evaluated? Reference _____)

c. Are there impediments affecting your ability to contract for the above named project?

_x_ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, have you taken measures to address the impact of these impediments? Reference _____)

7909a.7

d. Have you received any formal complaints from the private sector regarding this project?

_x_ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, how have the complaints been addressed? Reference _____

If proper references to the above questions are not constrained in the SRTP, please elaborate under a separate heading as part of "12. PLANNING JUSTIFICATION" below.

12. ADDITIONAL PLANNING JUSTIFICATION:

The PCS is the commuter rail system that currently services the San Francisco Peninsula between San Jose and the existing terminal station in San Francisco located at Fourth and Townsend.

The present condition of the terminal at its Fourth & Townsend Street site (at grade) is not considered desirable either from transportation or land use/public planning perspectives and is not consistent with the proposed Mission Bay Plan in San Francisco.

In September 1988, the JPB initiated an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/EIR) in compliance with the Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA), the California Quality Act (CEQA) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). This UMTA sanctioned study, is analyzing alternative site locations in terms of capital and operating costs, patronage projections, and environmental impacts. The overall objective of the study is to identify a cost-effective and desirable location for the PCS's downtown terminal station so that it best serves the transit patrons, most of whom are designed to the downtown San Francisco. A draft report for public and agency review is expected in April 1990. At that time, a preferred alternative will be selected.

In March 1988, a regional concensus was reached on MTC'S New Rail Starts and Extensions Program. This program (Res. No. 1876) includes the San Francisco Terminal Relocation Project and a proposed agreement to fund the project. Federal funds will be sought for approximately twenty-five percent of the project costs. The remaining funds will come from State Rail Bonds (assuming passage in June 1990) and the San Mateo County Transportation Authority.

A meeting was held with TOCC and Washington, D.C. representatives on January 24, 1990 where agreement was reached to finance preliminary engineering using UMTA Section 9 funds.

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION WORKSHEET
For Projects Submitted For FY 91/97
of MTC's Transit Capital Priorities

1. OPERATOR: Caltrans/JPB

2. PROJECT NAME: Wheelchair Accessibility

3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Install wheelchair lifts on 21 passenger cars to make CalTrain accessible to elderly and handicapped patrons.

4. PROJECT CLASS: (2) Reconditioned Revenue Vehicles

5. SRTP PAGE REFERENCE: II-8 TIP PAGE REFERENCE: I-6-17

6. PROPOSED FEDERAL FUNDING: $5,000,000 ($3,372,932 SF/O UZA; $1,627,068 SJ UZA) SOURCE: Section 9

7. PROPOSED LOCAL MATCH (26%): $1,738,000 SOURCE: PVEA/PEAF

8. TOTAL PROJECT COST: $6,738,000

9. PRIOR UMTA FUNDING: none

10. ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT TYPE AND STATUS: (NR)

NEPA STATUS: 23 cfr 771.117a; c15
CEQA STATUS: Cal.Admin.Code, Section 15302

11. COMPLIANCE WITH PRIVATE SECTOR PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENTS
(PLEASE COMPLETE FOR ANNUAL ELEMENT PROJECTS ONLY):

a. Was the private sector involved in the development on this project as set forth in your adopted policy?

_____ No. _X_ Yes: SRTP Page Reference Appendix ___

b. Were proposals received from the private sector to operate, construct, or otherwise provide all or part of the above named project?

_X_ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, how were those proposals evaluated? Reference _____)

c. Are there impediments affecting your ability to contract for the above named project?

_X_ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, have you taken measures to address the impact of these impediments? Reference _____)

d. Have you received any formal complaints from the private sector regarding this project?

_X_ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, how have the complaints been addressed? Reference _____

If proper references to the above questions are not constrained in the SRTP, please elaborate under a separate heading as part of "12. PLANNING JUSTIFICATION" below.

12. ADDITIONAL PLANNING JUSTIFICATION:

As part of the station improvement program, Caltrans has been studying methods of making the Peninsula Commute Service accessible to wheelchairs. Caltrns initial accessibility study titled "Peninsula Commute Rail Service Accessibility Study" was completed in February 1987. The study recommended construction of "mini-high" platforms at stations, with access through the vestibule doors. SP, as operator of the service, expressed concerns over this recommendation because of operational problems. Recently, an on-board lift has proven to be successful on the San Diego Light Rail system and both SP and Caltrans feel it has application to the PCS. Caltrans is planning a demonstration project that would test the on-board lift on the PCS. As part of this accessibility project, Caltrans plans to also make the restroom on-board the train accessible to wheelchairs.

Caltrans will be testing two alternatives for accessibility: (1) retrofit existing cab-control car with wheelchair lift and modify existing restroom to make it accessible; and (2) retrofit an existing trailer car with wheelchair lift and add an accessible restroo. Lifts from two different manufacturers will be tested on each car; one on each side of the train. A consultant will be retained to develop the testing and evaluation procedures. Based on the consultant's evaluation and recommendation following the demonstration project, a decision will be made whether to retrofit the remaining 20 cab-control cars or 20 passenger trailer cars with the preferred lifting mechanism.

The demonstration project, including the performance evaluation, is expected to cost $1,530,000. Caltrans has requested a Letter of No Prejudice from UMTA to expend local funds to initiate the demonstrtion phase of the project without jeopardizing Federal Section 9 funds requested in FY 1990/91.

The Sumitomo Corportion, manufacturer of the CalTrain passenger cars, has estimated that it will cost approximately $4.6 million to retrofit the remaining 20 cab-control cars with accessibility features and $5.2 million to retrofit 20 trailer cars. Therefore, Caltrans is seeking to program $6.7 million ($5.0 million Section 9, $1.7 million State and Local matching funds) in FY 1990/91 to complete the accessibility project. Local Petroleum Violation Escrow Account funds (PVEA) and State Passenger Equipment Acquisition Fund (PEAF) monies have already been committed to the project. Caltrans is also seeking TCI funds to complete the project.

7909a.19

IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE AND EXPENDITURE PLAN
Date: 19-Jul-90

Project: Wheelchair Accessibility
Operator: CalTrain

Initial Clearances Required:

IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE:	FY 90-91 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 91-92 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 92-93 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 93-94 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4
TASK 1: Demo Retrofit 2 cars	9 months			
TASK 2: Demo Evaluation	6 months			
TASK 3: Contract Process		3 months		
TASK 4: Retrofit 20 cars			16 months	

o: Clearances and Approvals

EXPENDITURE PLAN (000S):	FY 90-91	FY 91-92	FY 92-93	FY 93-94
UMTA Section 9		1,875	3,125	
UMTA Section 3				
Other Federal				
Article XIX				
TP&D				
108 Rail Bonds				
116 Rail Bonds				
Other State	1,530 (LONP)	78	130	
Local Funds				
(source:)				
TOTAL FUNDS:	1,530	1,953	3,255	0

SAN JOSE URBANIZED AREA
Designated Recipient: METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Grantee: SANTA CLARA COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT

UMTA SECTION 9 FUNDS PROGRAMMED

FY 1990-91 Apportionment (Est.):	$14,682,021
FY 1989-90 Carryover Funds:	901,855
TOTAL:	$15,583,876

PROGRAM OF PROJECTS
OPERATING ASSISTANCE

	UMTA Section 9 Funds	Local Match	FY 1990-91 Net Project Cost
SCCTD *	$6,157,852	$113,234,724	$119,392,576

PROGRAM OF PROJECTS
CAPITAL PROJECTS

	UMTA Section 9 Funds	Local Match	Total FY 1990-91 Cost
SCCTD			
Replacement Buses (41)	$6,530,874	$1,632,719	$8,163,593
	$6,530,874	$1,632,719	$8,163,593
TOTAL GRANTEE PROGRAM:	$12,688,726	$114,867,443	$127,556,169

* For the period July 1, 1990 to June 30, 1991.

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION WORKSHEET
For Projects Submitted For The Annual Element
of MTC's Transit Capital Priorities

1. OPERATOR: SCCTD

2. PROJECT NAME: Bus System Replacements FY 91-97

3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Acquisition of three hundred and thirty (40') Advanced Design Buses over the seven year period. (41 buses in FY 91)

4. PROJECT CLASS: (1) New Revenue Vehicles

5. SRTP PAGE REFERENCE: pg. 38 TIP PAGE REFERENCE: I-6-57

6. PROPOSED FEDERAL FUNDING: $6,530,874 SOURCE: UMTA Section 9

7. PROPOSED LOCAL MATCH (20%): $1,632,719 SOURCE: STA, District Funds

8. TOTAL PROJECT COST: $8,163,593

9. PRIOR UMTA FUNDING: none

10. ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT TYPE AND STATUS: (NR)

NEPA STATUS: 23 cfr 771.117c17
CEQA STATUS: 14 Cal.Admin.Code, Section 15302

11. COMPLIANCE WITH PRIVATE SECTOR PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENTS
(PLEASE COMPLETE FOR ANNUAL ELEMENT PROJECTS ONLY):

a. Was the private sector involved in the development on this project as set forth in your adopted policy?

_____ No. _X_ Yes: SRTP Page Reference ___12_____

b. Were proposals received from the private sector to operate, construct, or otherwise provide all or part of the above named project?

_X_ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference __12_____
(If yes, how were those proposals evaluated? Reference _____)

c. Are there impediments affecting your ability to contract for the above named project?

_X_ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference ___12____
(If yes, have you taken measures to address the impact of these impediments? Reference _____)

7909a.9

d. Have you received any formal complaints from the private sector regarding this project?

_X_ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference ___12_____
(If yes, how have the complaints been addressed? Reference _____

If proper references to the above questions are not constrained in the SRTP, please elaborate under a separate heading as part of "12. PLANNING JUSTIFICATION" below.

12. ADDITIONAL PLANNING JUSTIFICATION:

a. Background

It is the policy of the SCCTD to maintain an average fleet age of 6 years, which is one half the reasonable life expectancy of 12 years for standard coaches. The timing and size of the replacement bus orders programmed are based on 1) the relative reliability of sub-fleets 2) the age of the buses to be replaced and 3) fleet standardization by yard. The SCCTD's FY 90 SRTP pages 38 and 39 contain additional criteria for determining bus replacement eligibility and schedule. This criteria is applicable not only for bus replacement procurement up to FY 94, the cut off year for the FY 90 SRTP, but also for procurements in FY 95, 96 and 97.

The following table shows the replacement schedule up to FY 97;

Program Year	No. of Coaches to be replaced	Type	Age	Funding
90-91	41	RTS II-02	12	Sec. 9/STA
91-92	55	Gruman Flexibles	12	Sec. 9/STA
92-93	50	"	13	Sec. 9/STA
93-94	50	"	14	Sec. 9/STA
94-95	50	"	14	Sec. 9/STA
95-96	42	Flx-Metro	12	Sec. 9/STA
96-97	42	Flx-Metro	12	Sec. 9/STA

The total project cost includes the cost for wheelchair accessibility, electronic destination sign, project administration and contingency.

b. Project Merit

1. Passenger Benefits

The bus replacement program is essential to maintaining service reliability, and schedule adherence.

2. System Productivity

The bus replacement program is essential to a reasonable mechanical maintenance program. The operation of old and high maintenance requirement buses results in a proportionately higher cost in maintenance effort for those subfleets thatn for the rest of the fleet.

The timely replacement of coaches when due reduces the technological spread between subfleets which allows for greater consolidation of training and parts programs.

The related fleet effectiveness program will provide for reduction of the spare ratio to 20% during the five year program.

3. Regional Goals/Policies

The buses will be replaced with accessible equipment. Upon completion of this five year period the SCCTD fleet will be 100% lift equipped.

4. Maintaining Existing Service

The replacement policy is fundamental to deployment sufficient to maintain the programmed bus service.

7909a.11

BUS REPLACEMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1991

BUS NUMBER	MANUFACTURE	AGE OF BUS REPLACEMENT	PROJECTED MILEAGE @ REPLACEMENT
1101	RTS 35'	12	#
1103	"	"	#
1104	"	"	#
1105	"	"	#
1106	"	"	#
1107	"	"	#
1110	"	"	#
1112	"	"	#
1113	"	"	#
1114	"	"	#
1116	"	"	#
1117	"	"	#
1118	"	"	#
1119	"	"	#
1122	"	"	#
1123	"	"	#
1124	"	"	#
1125	"	"	#
1126	"	"	#
1127	"	"	#
1128	"	"	#
1130	"	"	#
1131	"	"	#
1132	"	"	#
1133	"	"	#
1134	"	"	#
1135	"	"	#
1136	"	"	#
1137	"	"	#
1138	"	"	#
1139	"	"	#
1140	"	"	#
1142	"	"	#
1143	"	"	#
1144	"	"	#
1145	"	"	#
1146	"	"	#
1147	"	"	#
1148	"	"	#
1149	"	"	#

NO PROJECTED MILEAGE AT REPLACEMENT REPORTED HERE SINCE AGE AT REPLACEMENT IS >= 12 YEARS.

IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE AND EXPENDITURE PLAN
Date: January 29, 1990

Project: Replacement Bus Procurement
Operator: SCCTD

Initial Clearances Required:

IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE:	FY 90-91 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 91-92 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 92-93 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 93-94 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4
TASK 1: Procure 41 ADBS	XXXXXXXXXXXX			
TASK 2: Procure 55 ADB		XXXXXXXXXXXX		
TASK 3: Procure 50 ADB			XXXXXXXXXXXX	
Procure 50 ADB				XXXXXXXXXX

O: Clearances and Approvals

EXPENDITURE PLAN (000's):	FY 90-91	FY 91-92	FY 92-93	FY 93-94
UMTA SEC. 9	6,530,874	9,198,948	8,780,800	9,219,840
UMTA SEC. 3				
OTHER FED.				
STATE TP&D				
ARTICLE XIX				
RAIL BONDS				
PCL BONDS				
OTHER STATE				
LOCAL FUNDS SOURCE: STA/ ½¢ sales tax	1,632,719	2,299,737	2,195,200	2,304,960
TOTAL FUNDS	8,163,593	11,498,685	10,976,000	11,524,800

-blank-

FY 1990-91 SECTION 9 PROGRAM OF PROJECTS

ANTIOCH-PITTSBURG URBANIZED AREA

ANTIOCH / PITTSBURG URBANIZED AREA
Designated Recipient: GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

UMTA SECTION 9 FUNDS PROGRAMMED	
FY 1990-91 Apportionment (Est.):	$659,407
FY 1989-90 Carryover Funds:	2,467,536
TOTAL:	$3,126,943

PROGRAM OF PROJECTS
OPERATING ASSISTANCE

	UMTA Section 9 Funds	UMTA Section 9 Cumulative Total
BART	$0	
	$0	
		$0

PROGRAM OF PROJECTS
CAPITAL PROJECTS

	UMTA Section 9 Funds	UMTA Section 9 Cumulative Total	Local Match	Total FY 1990-91 Cost
BART				
Railroad Ave. Park/Ride	$552,720		$138,180	$690,900
Brentwood Park/Ride	281,400		70,350	351,750
	$834,120		$208,530	$1,042,650
		$834,120		

ANTIOCH / PITTSBURG URBANIZED AREA
Designated Recipient: GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Grantee: BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT

UMTA SECTION 9 FUNDS PROGRAMMED	
FY 1990-91 Apportionment (Est.):	$659,407
FY 1989-90 Carryover Funds:	2,467,536
TOTAL:	$3,126,943

PROGRAM OF PROJECTS
OPERATING ASSISTANCE

	UMTA Section 9 Funds	Local Match	FY 1990-91 Net Project Cost
BART *	$0	$119,098,800	$119,098,800

PROGRAM OF PROJECTS
CAPITAL PROJECTS

	UMTA Section 9 Funds	Local Match	Total FY 1990-91 Cost
BART			
Railroad Ave. Park/Ride	$552,720	$138,180	$690,900
Brentwood Park/Ride	281,400	70,350	351,750
	$834,120	$208,530	$1,042,650
TOTAL GRANTEE PROGRAM:	$834,120	$119,307,330	$120,141,450

* For the period July 1, 1990 to June 30, 1991.

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION WORKSHEET
For Projects Submitted For the Annual Element
of MTC's Transit Capital Priorities

1. OPERATOR: SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT

2. PROJECT NAME: RAILROAD AVENUE PARK/RIDE (RRAVE-PR.PJW)

3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The purpose of this project is to acquire land and construct a 200 space park/ride lot.

4. PROJECT CLASS: 7

5. SRTP PAGE REFERENCE: 22 TIP PAGE REFERENCE: I-6-9

6. PROPOSED FEDERAL FUNDING: $ 552,720 SOURCE: Section 9

7. PROPOSED LOCAL MATCH (20%): $ 138,180 SOURCE: Operator

8. TOTAL PROJECT COST: $ 690,900

9. PRIOR UMTA FUNDING: None

10. ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT TYPE AND STATUS:

CEQA STATUS: Initial study per Guidelines Sec. 15063 will be circulated in FY 1990-91.
NEPA STATUS: Environmental Assessment per 23 CFR 771.119 will be circulated in FY 1990-91.

11. COMPLIANCE WITH PRIVATE SECTOR PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENTS
(PLEASE COMPLETE FOR ANNUAL ELEMENT PROJECTS ONLY):

a. Was the private sector involved in the development on this project as set forth in your adopted policy?

__X__ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____

b. Were proposals received from the private sector to operate, construct, or otherwise provide all or part of the above named projects?

__*__ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, how were those proposals evaluated? Reference _____)

c. Are there impediments affecting your ability to contract for the above named project?

__X__ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, have you taken measures to address the impact of these impediments? Reference _____)

7906a.48

7906a

d. Have you received any formal complaints from the private sector regarding this project?

__X__ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, how have the complaints been addressed? Reference _____)

* Construction of the park/ride will be contracted out. The contract or contracts will adhere to BART's established competitive bidding guidelines as set forth in the Procurement Process, revised September 17, 1985.

12. ADDITIONAL PLANNING JUSTIFICATION:

This 200-space park/ride lot will provide access to BART Express Bus lines which feed the BART rail system. The funds for this project are from the Section 9 Pittsburg/Antioch urbanized area.

IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE AND EXPENDITURE PLAN

Date: January 30, 1990

Project: Railroad Aveneue Park/Ride
Operator: SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT

Initial Clearances Required:

IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE:	FY 89/90 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 90/91 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 91/92 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4
EIR	==========			
Land Acquisition		========	===	
Design		========	===	
Bid/Award			O====O	
Construction			===	======

O: Clearances and Approvals

X 000

EXPENDITURE PLAN (000$):	FY 90/91	FY	FY	FY
UMTA SEC. 9	552,720			
UMTA SEC. 3				
OTHER FED.				
STATE TP&D				
ARTICLE XIX				
RAIL BONDS				
PCL BONDS				
OTHER STATE				
LOCAL FUNDS				
SOURCE: BRIDGE TOLLS	138,180			
TOTAL FUNDS	690,900			

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION WORKSHEET
For Projects Submitted For the Annual Element
of MTC's Transit Capital Priorities

1. OPERATOR: SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT

2. PROJECT NAME: BRENTWOOD PARK/RIDE (BRENT-PR.PJW)

3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION: This project will construct a 100-space park/ride lot in the City of Brentwood.

4. PROJECT CLASS: 7

5. SRTP PAGE REFERENCE: 22 TIP PAGE REFERENCE: I-6-9

6. PROPOSED FEDERAL FUNDING: $ 281,400 SOURCE: Section 9

7. PROPOSED LOCAL MATCH (20%): $ 70,350 SOURCE: Operator

8. TOTAL PROJECT COST: $351,750

9. PRIOR UMTA FUNDING: None

10. ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT TYPE AND STATUS:

CEQA STATUS: Initial study per Guidelines Sec. 15063 will be circulated in FY 1990-91.
NEPA STATUS: Environmental Assessment per 23 CFR 771.119 will be circulated in FY 1990-91.

11. COMPLIANCE WITH PRIVATE SECTOR PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENTS (PLEASE COMPLETE FOR ANNUAL ELEMENT PROJECTS ONLY):

a. Was the private sector involved in the development on this project as set forth in your adopted policy?

__X__ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____

b. Were proposals received from the private sector to operate, construct, or otherwise provide all or part of the above named projects?

__*__ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, how were those proposals evaluated? Reference _____)

c. Are there impediments affecting your ability to contract for the above named project?

__X__ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, have you taken measures to address the impact of these impediments? Reference _____)

d. Have you received any formal complaints from the private sector regarding this project?

__X__ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, how have the complaints been addressed? Reference _____)

* Construction of the park/ride will be contracted out. The contract or contracts will adhere to BART's established competitive bidding guidelines as set forth in the Procurement Process, revised September 17, 1985.

12. ADDITIONAL PLANNING JUSTIFICATION:

This project will construct a 100-space park/ride lot in the City of Brentwood on land previously acquired with BART funds. The funds for this project are from the Section 9 Pittsburg/Antioch urbanized area.

IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE AND EXPENDITURE PLAN

Date: January 30, 1990

Project: Brentwood Park/Ride
Operator: SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT

Initial Clearances Required:

IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE:	FY 89/90 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 90/91 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 91/92 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4	FY 92/93 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4
EIR	==========			
Prepare RFP		===		
Bid/Award		O=======O		___
Construction			==========	

O: Clearances and Approvals

X 000

EXPENDITURE PLAN (000$):	FY 90/91	FY	FY	FY
UMTA SEC. 9	281,400			
UMTA SEC. 3				
OTHER FED.				
STATE TP&D				
ARTICLE XIX				
RAIL BONDS				
PCL BONDS				
OTHER STATE				
LOCAL FUNDS SOURCE: BRIDGE TOLLS	70,350			
TOTAL FUNDS	351,750			

FY 1990-91 SECTION 9 PROGRAM OF PROJECTS

FAIRFIELD URBANIZED AREA

FAIRFIELD URBANIZED AREA
Designated Recipient: GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

UMTA Section 9 Funds Programmed	
FY 1990-91 Apportionment (Est.):	$415,992
FY 1989-90 Carryover Funds:	$15,992
TOTAL:	$431,984

PROGRAM OF PROJECTS
OPERATING ASSISTANCE

	UMTA Section 9 Funds	UMTA Section 9 Cumulative Total
Fairfield	$272,000	
	$272,000	
		$272,000

PROGRAM OF PROJECTS
CAPITAL PROJECTS

	UMTA Section 9 Funds	UMTA Section 9 Cumulative Total	Local Match	Total FY 1990-91 Cost
Fairfield				
No Capital Projects	$0			
	$0			
		$272,000		

FAIRFIELD URBANIZED AREA
Designated Recipient: GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Grantee: CITY OF FAIRFIELD

UMTA SECTION 9 FUNDS PROGRAMMED	
FY 1990-91 Apportionment (Est.):	$415,992
FY 1989-90 Carryover Funds:	$15,992
TOTAL:	$431,984

PROGRAM OF PROJECTS
OPERATING ASSISTANCE

	UMTA Section 9 Funds	Local Match	FY 1990-91 Net Project Cost
Fairfield *	$272,000	$300,140	$572,140

PROGRAM OF PROJECTS
CAPITAL PROJECTS

	UMTA Section 9 Funds	Local Match	Total FY 1990-91 Cost
Fairfield			
No Capital Projects	$0		
	$0		
TOTAL GRANTEE PROGRAM:	$272,000	$300,140	$572,140

* For the period July 1, 1990 to June 30, 1991.

FY 1990-91 SECTION 9 PROGRAM OF PROJECTS

NAPA URBANIZED AREA

NAPA URBANIZED AREA
Designated Recipient: GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

UMTA Section 9 Funds Programmed	
FY 1990-91 Apportionment (Est.):	$435,309
FY 1989-90 Carryover Funds:	$479,091
TOTAL:	$914,400

PROGRAM OF PROJECTS
OPERATING ASSISTANCE

	UMTA Section 9 Funds	UMTA Section 9 Cumulative Total
Napa	$397,550	
	$397,550	
		$397,550

PROGRAM OF PROJECTS
CAPITAL PROJECTS

	UMTA Section 9 Funds	UMTA Section 9 Cumulative Total	Local Match	Total FY 1990-91 Cost
Napa				
Bus Stop Improvements	$12,000		$3,000	$15,000
Accessible Taxivans (2)	56,000		14,000	70,000
Replacement Driver Seats (5)	4,000		1,000	5,000
Electronic Fareboxes (11)	96,000		24,000	120,000
Maintenance Equipment	32,000		8,000	40,000
Paratransit Vans (2)	72,000		18,000	90,000
	$272,000		$68,000	$340,000
		$669,550		

NAPA URBANIZED AREA
Designated Recipient: GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Grantee: CITY OF NAPA

UMTA SECTION 9 FUNDS PROGRAMMED	
FY 1990-91 Apportionment (Est.):	$435,309
FY 1989-90 Carryover Funds:	$479,091
TOTAL:	$914,400

PROGRAM OF PROJECTS
OPERATING ASSISTANCE

	UMTA Section 9 Funds	Local Match	FY 1990-91 Net Project Cost
Napa *	$397,550	$403,550	$801,100

PROGRAM OF PROJECTS
CAPITAL PROJECTS

	UMTA Section 9 Funds	Local Match	Total FY 1990-91 Cost
Napa			
Bus Stop Improvements	$12,000	$3,000	$15,000
Accessible Taxivans (2)	56,000	14,000	70,000
Replacement Driver Seats (5)	4,000	1,000	5,000
Electronic Fareboxes (11)	96,000	24,000	120,000
Maintenance Equipment	32,000	8,000	40,000
Paratransit Vans (2)	72,000	18,000	90,000
	$272,000	$68,000	$340,000
TOTAL GRANTEE PROGRAM:	$669,550	$471,550	$1,141,100

* For the period July 1, 1990 to June 30, 1991.

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION WORKSHEET
For Projects Submitted For FY 90/91
of MTC's Transit Capital Priorities

1. OPERATOR: City of Napa

2. PROJECT NAME: Bus Stop Improvements

3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Provide benches, shelters, loading pads and safety features at existing bus stops.

4. PROJECT CLASS: Safety, enhancement

5. SRTP PAGE REFERENCE: (1989) Pg 7-10 TIP PAGE REFERENCE: I-6-47

6. PROPOSED FEDERAL FUNDING: $12,000 SOURCE: UMTA Section 9

7. PROPOSED LOCAL MATCH (20%): $3,000 SOURCE: TDA Article 4

8. TOTAL PROJECT COST: $15,000

9. PRIOR UMTA FUNDING: $14,800 (1987-88)

10. ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT TYPE AND STATUS:

NEPA STATUS: 23 cfr 771.115(b)(8) Class II Categorically Exempt
CEQA STATUS: Title 14 CAC, Section 153001, Class II Exempt

11. COMPLIANCE WITH PRIVATE SECTOR PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENTS (CIRCULAR No. 7005.1): (PLEASE COMPLETE FOR ANNUAL ELEMENT PROJECTS ONLY):

a. Was the private sector involved in the development on this project as set forth in your adopted policy?

_____ No. _X_ Yes: SRTP Page Reference ___6-18_____

b. Were proposals received from the private sector to operate, construct, or otherwise provide all or part of the above named project?

_X_ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, how were those proposals evaluated? Reference _____)

c. Are there impediments affecting your ability to contract for the above named project?

_X_ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, have you taken measures to address the impact of these impediments? Reference _____)

d. Have you received any formal complaints from the private sector regarding this project?

_X_ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, how have the complaints been addressed? Reference _____

If proper references to the above questions are not constrained in the SRTP, please elaborate under a separate heading as part of "12. PLANNING JUSTIFICATION" below.

12. ADDITIONAL PLANNING JUSTIFICATION:

Installation of benches, shelters, and loading pads at key locations. Some stops do not have curb & gutter and get muddy, dusty, or have uneven surfaces. These stops will be improved. Benches will be installed at not more that 3 locations and shelters at not more than 2 locations.

Most of this work will be done by City crews. Benches & shelters will be purchased from private businesses through a competitive bid process.

7909a.23

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION WORKSHEET
For Projects Submitted For FY 90/91
of MTC's Transit Capital Priorities

1. OPERATOR: City and County of Napa

2. PROJECT NAME: Accessible Taxi Van Purchase

3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Purchase two (2) accessible taxi vans for City/County user-side subsidy program.

4. PROJECT CLASS: Enhancement (handicapped accessibility)

5. SRTP PAGE REFERENCE: pending TIP PAGE REFERENCE: I-6-47

6. PROPOSED FEDERAL FUNDING: $56,000 SOURCE: UMTA Section 9

7. PROPOSED LOCAL MATCH (20%): $14,000 SOURCE: TDA Article 8 (County)

8. TOTAL PROJECT COST: $70,000

9. PRIOR UMTA FUNDING: -0-

10. ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT TYPE AND STATUS:

NEPA STATUS: 23 cfr 771.115(b)(15) Categorically Exempt Class
CEQA STATUS: Title 14 CAC, Section 15301, Class 2 Categorically Exempt

11. COMPLIANCE WITH PRIVATE SECTOR PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENTS (CIRCULAR No. 7005.1): (PLEASE COMPLETE FOR ANNUAL ELEMENT PROJECTS ONLY):

a. Was the private sector involved in the development on this project as set forth in your adopted policy?

_____ No. _X_ Yes: SRTP Page Reference ___6-18____

b. Were proposals received from the private sector to operate, construct, or otherwise provide all or part of the above named project?

_X_ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, how were those proposals evaluated? Reference _____)

c. Are there impediments affecting your ability to contract for the above named project?

_X_ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, have you taken measures to address the impact of these impediments? Reference _____)

d. Have you received any formal complaints from the private sector regarding this project?

_X_ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, how have the complaints been addressed? Reference _____

If proper references to the above questions are not constrained in the SRTP, please elaborate under a separate heading as part of "12. PLANNING JUSTIFICATION" below.

12. ADDITIONAL PLANNING JUSTIFICATION:

The City proposes to purchase two low-floor small vans with ramps and tie-downs for leaseback to two local taxi operators who provide service to elderly and handicapped patrons of the City/County taxi scrip program. The County has agreed to provide accessible, demand responsive service to scrip passengers seven days per week, 24 hours per day.

The City proposes to use a competitive bid process in the purchase of these vehicles, and to make one vehicle available to each of the City's two taxi operators.

7909a.25

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION WORKSHEET
For Projects Submitted For FY 90/91
of MTC's Transit Capital Priorities

1. OPERATOR: City of Napa

2. PROJECT NAME: Replacement of Driver Seats - 5 vehicles

3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Replace driver seats with state-of-the art "air ride" seats in all fixed-axle coaches.

4. PROJECT CLASS: Replacement, enhancement.

5. SRTP PAGE REFERENCE: pending TIP PAGE REFERENCE: I-6-48

6. PROPOSED FEDERAL FUNDING: $4,000 SOURCE: UMTA Section 9

7. PROPOSED LOCAL MATCH (20%): $1,000 SOURCE: TDA Article 4

8. TOTAL PROJECT COST: $5,000

9. PRIOR UMTA FUNDING: -0-

10. ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT TYPE AND STATUS:

NEPA STATUS: 23 cfr 771.115(b)(14) Categorically Exempt Class II
CEQA STATUS: Title 14 CAC, Section 15301, Class I - existing facilities

11. COMPLIANCE WITH PRIVATE SECTOR PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENTS (CIRCULAR No. 7005.1): (PLEASE COMPLETE FOR ANNUAL ELEMENT PROJECTS ONLY):

a. Was the private sector involved in the development on this project as set forth in your adopted policy?

_____ No. _X_ Yes: SRTP Page Reference 6-18

b. Were proposals received from the private sector to operate, construct, or otherwise provide all or part of the above named project?

_X_ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, how were those proposals evaluated? Reference _____)

c. Are there impediments affecting your ability to contract for the above named project?

_X_ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, have you taken measures to address the impact of these impediments? Reference _____)

d. Have you received any formal complaints from the private sector regarding this project?

_X_ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, how have the complaints been addressed? Reference _____

If proper references to the above questions are not constrained in the SRTP, please elaborate under a separate heading as part of "12. PLANNING JUSTIFICATION" below.

12. ADDITIONAL PLANNING JUSTIFICATION:

Four buses received in 1986 and two buses received in 1987 have fixed axles, which provide a rigid shock-filled ride. This has proven to be hard on the backs of the drivers. As a trial, one "air-ride" seat was purchased and installed on one of these buses in 1989, and the ride was improved immensely for the driver, who had recently suffered back injuries due to an accident. This seat allowed her to return to work, where she would not have been able to with the old seats. The cost of the seats is about $500 each, and we will replace the remaining 5 driver seats.

The City proposes to purchase these seats from the most responsive bidder who can meet our specifications.

7909a.25

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION WORKSHEET
For Projects Submitted For FY 90/91
of MTC's Transit Capital Priorities

1. OPERATOR: City of Napa

2. PROJECT NAME: Electronic fareboxes

3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Purchase 11 electronic fareboxes for the City's bus fleet.

4. PROJECT CLASS: Enhancement

5. SRTP PAGE REFERENCE: (1989) Pg.7-10 TIP PAGE REFERENCE: I-6-47

6. PROPOSED FEDERAL FUNDING: $96,000 SOURCE: UMTA Section 9

7. PROPOSED LOCAL MATCH (20%): $24,000 SOURCE: TDA Article 4

8. TOTAL PROJECT COST: $120,000

9. PRIOR UMTA FUNDING: -0-

10. ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT TYPE AND STATUS:

NEPA STATUS: 23 cfr 771.115(b)(14) Categorically Exempt
CEQA STATUS: Title 14 CAC, Section 15301, Class II, Categorically Exempt

11. COMPLIANCE WITH PRIVATE SECTOR PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENTS (CIRCULAR No. 7005.1): (PLEASE COMPLETE FOR ANNUAL ELEMENT PROJECTS ONLY):

a. Was the private sector involved in the development on this project as set forth in your adopted policy?

_____ No. _X_ Yes: SRTP Page Reference ___6-18____

b. Were proposals received from the private sector to operate, construct, or otherwise provide all or part of the above named project?

_X_ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, how were those proposals evaluated? Reference _____)

c. Are there impediments affecting your ability to contract for the above named project?

_X_ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, have you taken measures to address the impact of these impediments? Reference _____)

d. Have you received any formal complaints from the private sector regarding this project?

_X_ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, how have the complaints been addressed? Reference _____

If proper references to the above questions are not constrained in the SRTP, please elaborate under a separate heading as part of "12. PLANNING JUSTIFICATION" below.

12. ADDITIONAL PLANNING JUSTIFICATION:

This project was originally scheduled to be implemented in FY 1991-92. We wish to move it up one year due to our rapidly increasing ridership, a planned fare increase in January of 1991, and the increased needs for accurate and timely data collection onboard the buses.

Electronic fareboxes will also enable us to do revenue based sampling for UMTA Section 15 reports.

The City plans to acquire these fareboxes through the competitive bid process.

7909a.29

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION WORKSHEET
For Projects Submitted For FY 90/91
of MTC's Transit Capital Priorities

1. OPERATOR: City of Napa

2. PROJECT NAME: Maintenance Equipment

3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Purchase of auxiliary equipment for the maintenance center expansion project.

4. PROJECT CLASS: Enhancement, expansion, safety

5. SRTP PAGE REFERENCE: pending TIP PAGE REFERENCE: I-6-48

6. PROPOSED FEDERAL FUNDING: $32,000 SOURCE: UMTA Section 9

7. PROPOSED LOCAL MATCH (20%): $8,000 SOURCE: TDA Article 4

8. TOTAL PROJECT COST: $40,000

9. PRIOR UMTA FUNDING: $125,000 (Maintenance Center Expansion)

10. ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT TYPE AND STATUS:

NEPA STATUS: 23 cfr 771.115(b)(19) Categorically Exempt
CEQA STATUS: Title 14 CAC, Section 15301, Class 2, Categorically Exempt

11. COMPLIANCE WITH PRIVATE SECTOR PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENTS (CIRCULAR No. 7005.1): (PLEASE COMPLETE FOR ANNUAL ELEMENT PROJECTS ONLY):

a. Was the private sector involved in the development on this project as set forth in your adopted policy?

_____ No. _X_ Yes: SRTP Page Reference 6-18

b. Were proposals received from the private sector to operate, construct, or otherwise provide all or part of the above named project?

_X_ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, how were those proposals evaluated? Reference _____)

c. Are there impediments affecting your ability to contract for the above named project?

_X_ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, have you taken measures to address the impact of these impediments? Reference _____)

d. Have you received any formal complaints from the private sector regarding this project?

_X_ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, how have the complaints been addressed? Reference _____

If proper references to the above questions are not constrained in the SRTP, please elaborate under a separate heading as part of "12. PLANNING JUSTIFICATION" below.

12. ADDITIONAL PLANNING JUSTIFICATION:

These funds will be used to purchase any recommended equipment needed for the expanded maintenance facility and not included in the original grant application for this expansion. Equipment may relate to safety, improved maintenance capacity, or improved efficiency.

All equipment is procured through competitive bid.

7909a.31

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION WORKSHEET
For Projects Submitted For FY 90/91
of MTC's Transit Capital Priorities

1. OPERATOR: City of Napa

2. PROJECT NAME: Purchase two accessible 15-passenger vans

3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Purchase two accessible 15-passenger vans to supplement the existing county sponsored dial-a-ride program.

4. PROJECT CLASS:

5. SRTP PAGE REFERENCE: Pending TIP PAGE REFERENCE: I-6-47

6. PROPOSED FEDERAL FUNDING: $72,000 SOURCE: UMTA Section 9

7. PROPOSED LOCAL MATCH (20%): $18,000 SOURCE: TDA Article 8 (County of Napa)

8. TOTAL PROJECT COST: $90,000

9. PRIOR UMTA FUNDING: None

10. ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT TYPE AND STATUS:

NEPA STATUS: 23 CFR, Section 771.115(b)(17) Class II - Categorically Exempt
CEQA STATUS: CAC Title 24, Section 15301 Class I - Categorically Exempt

11. COMPLIANCE WITH PRIVATE SECTOR PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENTS (CIRCULAR No. 7005.1): (PLEASE COMPLETE FOR ANNUAL ELEMENT PROJECTS ONLY):

a. Was the private sector involved in the development on this project as set forth in your adopted policy?

_____ No. _X_ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____

b. Were proposals received from the private sector to operate, construct, or otherwise provide all or part of the above named project?

_X_ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, how were those proposals evaluated? Reference _____)

c. Are there impediments affecting your ability to contract for the above named project?

_X_ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, have you taken measures to address the impact of these impediments? Reference _____)

7079a.35

d. Have you received any formal complaints from the private sector regarding this project?

_X_ No. _____ Yes: SRTP Page Reference _____
(If yes, how have the complaints been addressed? Reference _____

If proper references to the above questions are not constrained in the SRTP, please elaborate under a separate heading as part of "12. PLANNING JUSTIFICATION" below.

12. ADDITIONAL PLANNING JUSTIFICATION:

The preliminary need for these vehicles was developed during the annual unmet needs process.

The Volunteer Center operates the County-wide dial-a-ride program for the elderly and handicapped. Two of the vehicles in the fleet have accumulated over 100,000 miles, and are used primarily as back-up vehicles.

The Volunteer Center currently underutilizes all of the hours allotted to it for service, primarily due to the unavailability of reliable vehicles. With the addition of two new vans, the Volunteer Center could provide more frequent service from the rural areas into Napa, and develop a program for group shopping trips from Yountville and within Napa on a daily basis.

The specifications for these vehicles will be developed by the City of Napa, with input from the County, Volunteer Center, and local handicapped advisory committee. The vans will be purchased through competitive bidding.

The County of Napa has agreed to provide the 20% match required for this purchase.

CITY OF NAPA

UMTA Section 9 Program

1990-91

Capital Projects Implementation Schedule

Projects	Total $	UMTA $
Two Accessible Taxi-vans	$ 70,000	$ 56,000
Electronic Fareboxes	120,000	96,000
Bus Stop Improvements	15,000	12,000
Maintenance Support Equipment	40,000	32,000
Driver Seat Replacement	5,000	4,000
Two Accessible Vans	90,000	72,000

Task	Time Allotment
Receipt of Grant Award	January 1991
Issue Bids/Specifications	
Accessible Taxis	March 1991
Fareboxes	April 1991
Bus Stop Improvements	February 1991
Maintenance Support Equipment	February 1991
Driver Seats	February 1991
Accessible Vans	March 1991
Bid Openings	60 days after issuance of RFP
Award of Contracts/POS	Two weeks after bid opening
Project Completion Dates	
Accessible Taxis	September 1991
Fareboxes	September 1991
Bus Stop Improvements	May 1991
Maintenance Support Equipment	June 1991
Driver Seats	April 1991
Accessible Vans	September 1991

QUARTERLY ENCUMBERMENT AND DISBURSEMENT

	Encumberment	Disbursement
FY 1991 - 1	$ 60,000	
FY 1991 - 2		
FY 1991 - 3		$60,000
FY 1991 - 4	280,000	

The remainder of the federal funds will be disbursed in FY 1992.

7909a/38

-blank-

FY 1990-91 SECTION 9 PROGRAM OF PROJECTS

SANTA ROSA URBANIZED AREA

SANTA ROSA URBANIZED AREA
Designated Recipient: GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

UMTA Section 9 Funds Programmed	
FY 1990-91 Apportionment (Est.):	$913,281
FY 1989-90 Carryover Funds:	$577,378
TOTAL:	$1,490,659

PROGRAM OF PROJECTS
OPERATING ASSISTANCE

	UMTA Section 9 Funds	UMTA Section 9 Cumulative Total
Santa Rosa	$661,982	
Sonoma County	$0	
	$661,982	
		$661,982

PROGRAM OF PROJECTS
CAPITAL PROJECTS

	UMTA Section 9 Funds	UMTA Section 9 Cumulative Total	Local Match	Total FY 1990-91 Cost
Santa Rosa				
No Capital Projects	$0			
	$0			
		$661,982		
Sonoma County				
No Capital Projects	$0			
	$0			
		$661,982		

SANTA ROSA URBANIZED AREA
Designated Recipient: GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Grantee: CITY OF SANTA ROSA

UMTA SECTION 9 FUNDS PROGRAMMED	
FY 1990-91 Apportionment (Est.):	$913,281
FY 1989-90 Carryover Funds:	$577,378
TOTAL:	$1,490,659

PROGRAM OF PROJECTS
OPERATING ASSISTANCE

	UMTA Section 9 Funds	Local Match	FY 1990-91 Net Project Cost
Santa Rosa *	$661,982	$1,186,018	$1,848,000

PROGRAM OF PROJECTS
CAPITAL PROJECTS

	UMTA Section 9 Funds	Local Match	Total FY 1990-91 Cost
Santa Rosa			
No Capital Projects	$0		
	$0		
TOTAL GRANTEE PROGRAM.	$661,982	$1,186,018	$1,848,000

* For the period July 1, 1990 to June 30, 1991.

SANTA ROSA URBANIZED AREA
Designated Recipient: GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Grantee: COUNTY OF SONOMA

UMTA SECTION 9 FUNDS PROGRAMMED	
FY 1990-91 Apportionment (Est.):	$913,281
FY 1989-90 Carryover Funds:	$577,378
TOTAL:	$1,490,659

PROGRAM OF PROJECTS
OPERATING ASSISTANCE

	UMTA Section 9 Funds	Local Match	Total FY 1990-91 Cost
Sonoma *	$0	$2,764,600	$2,764,600

PROGRAM OF PROJECTS
CAPITAL PROJECTS

	UMTA Section 9 Funds	Local Match	Total FY 1990-91 Cost
Sonoma			
No Capital Projects	$0		
	$0		
TOTAL GRANTEE PROGRAM.	$0	$2,764,600	$2,764,600

* For the period July 1, 1990 to June 30, 1991.